HISTORICAL LIBRARY,

OF THE

CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PITTSBURG.

"What man would be wise, let him drink from the river
That bears on its waters the record of time."

No. 1104. Sept. 12. 1884.

Founded by Rev. A. A. LAMBING, A. M., April 17, 1884; that being the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the first Mass and first public act of religious service ever performed on the spot where Pittsburg now stands.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

http://www.archive.org/details/workscollectedar13henr

THE WORKS OF

ORESTES A. BROWNSON,

COLLECTED AND ARRANGED

BY

HENRY F. BROWNSON.

VOLUME XIII.

CONTAINING THE LAST PART OF THE WRITINGS ON CHRISTIANITY AND HEATHENISM IN POLITICS AND IN SOCIETY.

HISTORICAL LIBRARY OF THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PITTSBURG, PA.
HOLY GHOST FATHERS SCHOLASTICATE

DETROIT:
THORNDIKE NOURSE, PUBLISHER.
1884.

HOLY GHOST FATHERS SCHOLASTICATE FERNDALE, PA.

r
B909
86
1882x
vol. 13
cop. 2

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Conversations on Liberalism and the Church	1
Independence of the Church	86
The Church and Monarchy	107
Union of Church and State	127
The Bishops of Rome	146
Future of Protestantism and Catholicity:—	
Article I., The Secular Spirit	162
" II., National Wealth	184
" III., Civil and Political Liberty	201
Last Article, Religious Liberty	222
The School Question	241
Church and State	263
Unification and Education	284
The Secular not Supreme	303
The Papacy and the Republic	326
The Döllingerites, Nationalists, and the Papacy	351
Manning's Lectures	370
Bismarck and the Church	384
Whose is the Child?	400
Papal Infallibility	412
The Church Above the State	430
Education and the Republic	445
Gallicanism and Ultramontanism	462
Papal Infallibility and Civil Allegiance	483
Newman's Reply to Gladstone	499
The Public School System	515
The Family, Christian and Pagan	526
Father Thébaud's Irish Race	547
Protestant Journalism	567

JAN 3 1983

CONVERSATIONS ON LIBERALISM AND THE CHURCH.

PREFACE.

This little volume must speak for itself. The Conversations turn on questions of the day and the hour, and taken as a whole they form a passable defence of the church against the objections urged in the name of liberalism and progress, or so-called modern civilization. They are not purely imaginary, but such as I have really had time and again with the enemies of the church, who object to her principally on political and social grounds.

The form of the work has been adopted for my own convenience and that of the reader, and I hope will not be found objectionable. The doctrine is, I believe, rigidly orthodox. I have sought neither to offend the world nor to conciliate it. I do not believe in making concessions of what is not mine to concede. I have explained the teachings of the church where they conflict with the spirit of the age, but I have not sought to conform them to that spirit. The church was instituted by our Lord to govern the world according to the divine reason and will, not to be governed by it. These Conversations are respectfully dedicated to all who have or seek after Christian Truth, by

THE AUTHOR.

Elizabeth, N. J., April, 1869.

I.—During the intense heat of the summer days of 1868, I was ordered by my physicians to try the virtues of a newly-discovered mineral spring, in a distant state, which was beginning to acquire considerable reputation. The number of visitors was not large, for it had not yet become a fashionable watering-place, and few, except such as were really in pursuit of health, or at least desirous of recruiting their exhausted energies, visited it. They were chiefly overworked lawyers, merchants, traders, editors, and ministers of religion, who required relaxation from labor and rest, with freedom from their ordinary cares and anxieties.

I belonged to none of those classes. I had no profession, no occupation, and, with a moderate but competent estate

inherited from my grandfather, I was free to follow my own tastes and pleasures. I was past middle age, unmarried, and had no near relatives dependent on me for support or protection. I was as free as a man can be in this world; had originally an excellent constitution, which I had not always respected, and was now suffering from early imprudences and ills incident to idleness and good living. My real complaint was, that I had nothing to do, or to take up my attention; so, as I said, my physicians ordered me to try the waters of the new spa. I cannot say much for the waters, but the journey I was forced to make, the change of scenery, the pure mountain air, and the intellectual and intelligent company I found had their effect, and, after an absence of a few months, I returned to my home completely renovated in body, and with my mind engaged with a subject not unlikely to occupy the rest of my life.

While at the spring, around which had sprung up a small village called Springdale, consisting of an unfinished meeting-house, one or two boarding-houses, and a large hotel, I formed the acquaintance of several gentlemen whose conversation interested me much. Among them were two who particularly attracted my attention. One, many years the elder, was apparently a minister or a priest, with a quiet and unobtrusive manner, evidently a man of foreign birth and education, but speaking English as if it had been his native tongue. He must have been at least threescore and ten, but his form was erect and his eye undimmed, his natural strength unabated, and his voice unbroken, sweet, melodious, and sympathetic. He had for me a singular attraction, and I felt prepossessed in his favor at first sight. The other was an active, energetic man, under middle age, well made, with dark hair, heavy brows, and sharp, restless, black eyes. His manner was not rude, but brisk and a little imperious, and he spoke always in a bold, confident tone, from which no appeal might be taken. He gave always his opinion promptly and unhesitatingly on any and every subject that came up, and seemed to have left no subject in law, politics, theology, literature, science, or art on which he was not competent to pass a final judgment. It is hardly necessary to add that he was the chief editor of a leading metropolitan journal.

The two gentlemen were much together, and seemed to take no little interest in each other, although I could not discover that any topic was ever broached between them on

which they did not disagree very essentially. Their conversation, or rather their discussion, attracted me as a listener, at first as drawing off my thoughts from myself, and afterwards by the interest it awakened in the subjects on which it chiefly turned, and I seldom failed to hear it. Other guests seemed as much attracted as myself, and whenever we saw them seated under the shade of the old maple-trees left standing near our hotel, we formed a ring around them, and sat and listened in silence.

The editor was a man of our times, animated by the spirit of the age, and a firm believer in our glorious nineteenth century. "The greatest objection, Father," said he one day to the priest, as I soon learned he was, "to the church, is her unprogressive character. She fails to keep religion up with the times, refuses to advance with modern society, and the world goes on without her."

"Whither?" quietly asked the priest.

"Whither? Why, on its progressive march."

"Do you mean that the church herself is not progressive, or that she opposes progress in individuals and society?"

"Both. The church is stationary, remains what she was in the dark ages, does her best to keep society back where it was a thousand years ago, and to prevent the human race from taking a step forward."

"There is, I suppose, no doubt of that?"

"Not the least."

"Is it not possible for the church to remain immovable herself, and yet be very progressive in her influence on individuals and society generally?"

"To aid progress the church must be herself progressive."

"You see, then, neither argument nor wit in Dr. Johnson's reply to the learned butcher who gave it as his opinion that to criticise a great poet, one should himself be a great poet: 'Nonsense, sir! as well say he who kills fat oxen should himself be fat.' I have always thought differently. Progress is motion; and if I have not forgotten what my professor of mechanics taught me, there is no motion possible without something at rest. Motion requires a mover, and the mover cannot move unless it is itself immovable. A man cannot make any progress if he stands on a movable foundation, as you may see in the case of the poor fellow in the treadmill. Archimedes, in order to move the world, demanded a whereon to rest the fulcrum of his lever outside of the world he proposed to move. The church, if herself

movable or progressive, could not aid either social or individual progress; she would simply change with the changes going on around her, and could neither aid nor control them."

"But, Reverend Father, you overlook the fact that it is precisely in herself that progress is most needed. She teaches the same dogmas and claims the same authority over the mind, the heart, and the conscience in this enlightened age, and in this free republic, that she did in the barbarous ages under feudalism, and what she teaches and claims ceases to be in harmony with men's convictions, or their sense of their own rights and dignity."

The church, then, you think, in order to be able to serve the world, should not govern it, but suffer herself to be governed by it, and take care to teach it only what it already believes and holds? This is a very good principle, no doubt, for a journalist, who seeks only a wide circulation for his journal, but do you think our Lord acted on it? Did he find the convictions of the world he came to redeem and save in harmony with his doctrines and claims? If so, how came the Jews to reject him and crucify him between two thieves? Did the apostles teach only such doctrines and put forth only such claims as were in harmony with the sentiments and convictions of their age? Why, then, did their age make martyrs of them? How much would our Lord and his apostles or Christians during the martyr ages have done to advance the world, think you, if they had only echoed its opinions, approved its superstitions, and suffered themselves to be dictated to and governed by it? Would you have the church conform to the world and be a time-server? For my part, I have always held the church to be instituted to teach and govern all men and nations in all things spiritual, and not to be taught and governed by them."

"That is precisely my objection. The church places herself above the people, assumes to be wiser than they, claims the right to govern them, and therefore denies their sovereignty."

"Their sovereignty in spirituals, certainly; in temporals, as against the inherent sovereignty of kings or nobilities, not at all. But you are losing sight of your objection. You objected to the church that she is not progressive, teaches now the same doctrines and makes the same claims that she taught and made in the dark ages. Be it so. Are those doc-

trines false and unfounded? If so, you should have objected their falsity and invalidity. If true and just, how can she depart from them without departing from truth and justice? Your objection is not well taken, unless you hold that truth and justice are variable, and change from age to age and from nation to nation, or as men's views of them change."

"Your church is undemocratic, and places herself above the people, allows the people no voice in her administration, or in determining the doctrines to be taught."

"All in good time, my dear Mr. Editor. Just at present, pray tell me if truth is variable—one thing to-day and another to-morrow?"

"Truth, like every thing else, is progressive."

"Do you mean that the truth itself is progressive, or that our knowledge of it is progressive?"

"Progress is the law of the universe."

"Of the created universe, in relation to the end for which it exists, be it so; but do you pretend that the Creator of the universe is progressive?"

"Why not?"

"Because he is being in its plenitude, and could not be Creator if he were not. Progress is going from imperfection towards perfection, and is predicable only of an existence that depends on another for its being, and that has not yet actualized all the possibilities of its nature. God is independent, needs only himself, is eternally perfect, is, as say the theologians, most pure act, in whose nature there are and can be no potentialities or unactualized possibilities, consequently in him there is no room for progress. To suppose him progressive, is to suppose him a creature, imperfect, dependent, movable; and to suppose him, or to suppose truth movable or progressive, is to fall into the error of those whom Plato calls the ancestors of the Greeks, who held that all things are in a perpetual flux and reflux, and that there is nothing fixed or stable. We should thus deny progress in the very act of asserting it."

"How so?"

"If all things are in a perpetual flux and reflux, there is for things neither beginning nor end, and without both no progress is possible. Progress is proceeding, morally as well as physically, from a starting-point to an end or goal. It means literally stepping forward, that is, action from a fixed point to a fixed point; remove the points, and no progress is conceivable. Before you can pronounce a man

progressive, you must know that he has a beginning as well as an end; so truth must have a beginning and an end, in order to be progressive. You must say the same of God. Will you say now that God is progressive?"

"I pretend not that. He is without variableness, or shadow of turning. But truth is not God."

"What is it then?"

"Nobody can say. We only know what it is in relation to us, or what seems to us to be true. We never know the absolute; our knowledge stops with the relative. Things may be true to you, and not to me; in one age or country, and not in another. I have no doubt that the doctrines and claims of the church were very admissible in the dark ages, and that they then served the cause of progress, of religion, of civilization. They were then in harmony with the age, and were true and useful; but that does not imply that they are either now."

"Beware, my dear friend, of the treadmill. It is painful to be compelled to stand on the wheel, to keep stepping from morning to evening and never get a step forward. But will you tell me what doctrines or claims of the church were true and useful in the dark ages that are false and hurtful now?"

"We need not descend to particulars. There is no doubt that the church for several centuries after the fall of the Roman empire of the West, was a powerful and beneficent institution, and exerted a happy influence in promoting civilization. She saved from utter destruction the arts, the literature, and the sciences of the old Græco-Roman world: she softened the manners, and infused the sentiments of humanity into the hearts of the rude barbarians that issued forth from the forests of Germany and seated themselves on the ruins of the empire, by preaching to them the doctrine of brotherly love, by presenting them as the model of all excellence the meek and lowly Jesus, going about doing good when he had not where to lay his head, and dying on the cross for the redemption of his enemies, whom with his latest breath he forgave and prayed for. But having done that work, she is now only in the way of further progress."

"The preservation of the arts, literature, and sciences of the old Græco-Roman world could do nothing to advance civilization beyond the point reached by Greece and Rome, and therefore can hardly be said to have done any thing for progress. Was it by what she retained of the old civiliza-

tion that she tamed and humanized the barbarians, or by what she added of her own? You say what she added by her doctrine of brotherly love, or the brotherhood of the race, and the example of the meek and lowly Jesus, presented as the model of excellence. Well, are these things less true and useful now than they were then? Or is there any doctrine the church teaches, or any claim she puts forth to govern or discipline her own children, true and useful in relation to past ages or nations, that is not equally so now?"

"Whether the church was or was not relatively true and useful in those ages that knew no better than to believe her dogmas, practise her worship, and submit to her despotic authority, it is certain that she is hostile to all modern civilization, and the chief obstacle to progress, or the organization of society according to the laws of nature."

Here I thought the able editor rather evaded than met the home question of the venerable priest. Though all the listeners were against the priest and on the side of the metropolitan editor, their looks indicated that they wished him to state specifically and distinctly what in the church was true and useful at one time that can be false and hurtful at another. They all believed that the church had corrupted the faith, and buried it beneath a mass of unmeaning ceremonies, degrading superstitions, and human or satanic inventions, but they could not concede that truth itself is variable, or that the good effected was effected by any thing not always and everywhere true and useful.

II.—"You say, my dear Editor," replied the priest, "that the church is hostile to modern civilization, and an obstacle to individual and social progress. One thing at a time, if you please. I presume that you will agree with me that before we can decide what favors or retards progress, we must determine what is or is not progress. Will you tell me what you understand by progress?"

"Progress is leaving the dead past and moving forward towards the living future. It is a continual melioration or advance from the imperfect towards the perfect. It is the continual enlargement of the quantity of our being, or the realization of the possibilities of our nature."

"I would strike out from your definition the enlargement of the quantity of our being, because our being is not in ourselves, but in God, in whom 'we live and move and are,'

and therefore can neither be increased nor diminished, since God is being in its plenitude, and self-existent. The literal or etymological meaning of the word is, as I before said, 'a stepping forward.' When taken in a figurative sense, as we are now taking it, you very well define it to be an advance from the imperfect towards the perfect. But before we can assert progress, whether of the individual or of society, we must know that the perfect of each really exists, though not yet attained to, or that there really is an end in which the progress terminates because, when it is attained, the perfect is reached; and before we can say this or that favors or retards progress, we must know what this end or this perfect is, or, in other words, in what the perfection of society and the individual man consists."

"The perfection consists in the complete realization of the possibilities of nature."

"But how am I to determine what are the possibilities of my individual and social nature, or whether I am realizing them or not? Progress implies imperfection, incompleteness, for what is perfect, complete, is not and cannot be progressive, since there are in it no unrealized possibilities. Imperfection implies perfection, which is its complement or fulfilment. If there is no perfect, there can be no imperfect. How am I to determine what this perfect is, or what is the true end of man and society, so as to be able to assert what is or is not progress?"

"It is not necessary to determine what it is. One has but to follow nature, for nature points directly to it."

"You mean that nature of itself goes instinctively, by the force of its own inherent laws, to its end?"

"Such is my meaning."

"What is the use, then, of intelligence and moral effort? and wherein is there, then, any specific difference between man and the elemental forces of nature, between gratitude and gravitation, between virtue and vice, a moral act and an immoral act? Man would then act only as the winds and waves, storms and tempests, or as the thunderbolt that rives the oak—at best only as the beasts that perish. Call you this asserting the rights and dignity of man?"

"No; I recognize in man a moral nature."

"Right. But a moral nature acts for an end—*propter finem*, not simply to an end—*ad finem*, and therefore from intelligence and will, or reason. Then we must know the end, for we cannot will what we do not apprehend. Now

the church, my worthy young friend, teaches us what is this end, the true and last end of man, and also what is the end of society—points out the way we must go to attain to either, furnishes the means needed to gain it, and urges us by motives terrible as hell and as sweet and attractive as heaven to struggle for it. How, then, can you say that she is an obstacle to progress?"

"She may not oppose what she calls progress, but she opposes what this age understands by progress."

"That is possible. There are many things in which she and this age do not agree. But does she oppose any thing that *you* call progress?"

"She opposes popular education, the diffusion of intelligence among the people, is hostile to popular liberty, upholds tyrants and tyranny, and resists everywhere with all her power the introduction and establishment of popular government."

"May it not be that you mean one thing by these terms, and she another?"

"She opposes the emancipation of the people from ignorance and superstition, and their instruction in their rights and the means of asserting and maintaining them."

"Does the church oppose the emancipation of the people from what she holds to be ignorance and superstition, or their instruction in what she acknowledges to be their rights and dignity?"

"You asked me to say in what respect she opposes what I call progress. I call progress the enlightenment of the people, their emancipation by the diffusion of intelligence from ignorance and superstition, and their instruction in respect to their rights."

"Why not add to rights, *duties?* Men have duties as well as rights. Is that a true instruction which teaches men their rights, but says nothing as to their duties?"

"Men's duties grow out of their rights, and if duly instructed as to their rights, they can hardly remain ignorant of their duties."

"It would, perhaps, be more just to say men's rights grow out of their duties, but neither form of expression is exact. Men's duties grow out of their several relations, and their rights are simply their freedom to discharge their duties, or to act according to these relations, without any let or hindrance. Man has relations to his Creator, to his neighbor or society, and to the external world. Out of

these relations grow three classes of duties—duties to God, duties to our neighbor, and duties to the state or civil society that has charge of material interests, that is, religious, social, and political duties. In regard to these three classes of duties and their correlative rights, which cover the whole field of human activity, it shows great ignorance or great untruthfulness to pretend that the church opposes the instruction or enlightenment of the people. Has she not the sacrament of orders, and does she not educate and ordain a numerous class, as numerous a class as possible, of priests, one, and that not the least, of whose functions is to teach all ranks and conditions of men, even the poor of this world, whom the great neglect and the rich oppress, these three classes of rights and duties? Does she not found or encourage the founding of schools, academies, colleges, universities, for the education of the youth of all classes in the several sciences and the liberal arts, or general and special secular learning? Has she not religious orders and congregations of both sexes whose special vocation it is to teach your sons and daughters? Has she not founded nearly all the great universities of Europe, such as Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Salamanca, Alcalá?"

"Yet she opposes all efforts to emancipate the people from superstition, and in her schools she teaches ignorance, and repulses science."

"That she opposes the emancipation of the people from superstition, is a mistake. I am a priest, received my education partly in Spain and partly in Rome; I have travelled over most European countries, and over nearly every state in the American Union, and wherever I have been, whether in schools or seminaries, I have found her making it the duty of her priests and professors to do their best to free the people from all superstitious notions and practices. You cannot take up a single one of her catechisms for the instruction of children and youth that does not teach them to avoid superstition and all approach to it."

"That is all very well; but her own doctrines and practices are superstitious. What else is the doctrine that a little water sprinkled or poured on the head of an infant, and a few magical words mumbled by the priest at the same time, can regenerate the soul, and translate it into the kingdom of Christ?"

"Nothing instituted or commanded by our Lord can be superstition. He instituted the sacrament of baptism, com-

manded his apostles to go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and has declared that unless a man be born again of *water* and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The church neither believes nor teaches that the water or the words regenerate; they are only the outward or visible sacrament, through which the regenerating grace of the Holy Ghost is communicated."

"The church seeks to keep the people in ignorance, on the principle that ignorance is the mother of devotion."

"I have already shown you the contrary. But of what does she seek to keep the people ignorant? Is it of theology, the queen of the sciences? Is it of philosophy, of ethics, politics? Is it of astronomy, mathematics, mechanics, chemisty, electricity, cosmology, zoölogy, biology, physiology, philology, geology, botany, geography, history natural, civil, or ecclesiastical? I am aware of no prohibition against the study of any of these sciences. The church may not accept all the inductions or theories that many scientists are too prone to put forth as science, but she opposes no well-authenticated facts, and no well-established science. Indeed, my dear Editor, the church is so far from holding that ignorance is the mother of devotion, that she regards it as her worst enemy, and never ceases to combat it with all her energy."

"She is hostile to liberty, and opposes every effort made to advance it."

"The word *liberty* is much used, and much abused. It is taken in many senses, and not seldom in no definite sense at all. Men differ widely among themselves as to what is or is not true liberty, and no less as to the proper means of gaining or preserving it. In some of the senses in which the word is taken the church certainly opposes it, in others she approves and defends it. She opposes liberty in the sense of license or freedom from all law or authority; for she holds, what all experience teaches, that liberty in any good sense, cannot exist without law to define and protect it, and that law is inconceivable without a law-giver, and null without authority that has the right to enact and enforce it. But, on the other hand, she has always condemned tyranny and oppression, and at times gone so far as to excommunicate and depose the tyrant, and to absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance. Nearly all her doctors agree in teaching that the tyranny of the prince absolves the subject, though they uniformly condemn sedition, conspir-

acy, insurrection, or rebellion against the state as grievous sins as well as political crimes. The church loves, blesses, and protects liberty as she understands it, and her understanding of it, at the very lowest, is as likely to be just as is that of modern secret societies, who, in the name of liberty, practise the most outrageous tyranny over their members."

"Yet the reverend father will not deny that the church is opposed to popular or democratic government, and fulminates her anathemas against all who are laboring to introduce and establish democracy in Europe."

"I have observed, my dear friend, that your free-thinking gentlemen, who claim to be enlightened above ordinary mortals, are very neglectful of the categories, that they mix up the incongruous in the same sentence, make assertions that may be one-tenth true and nine-tenths false, and then conclude the truth of their whole assertion, as if all the incongruous matter jumbled together in it pertained to the same category. They probably thus deceive themselves, and certainly deceive others. You should mind the categories, and be always careful to define your terms. The church never opposes, but always supports, and requires her children to support, popular democratic government, when and where it is the legal order. She has never condemned democracy, nor erected any particular form or constitution of government into an article of faith, or a Catholic dogma. She requires all her children to obey the law, and to be loyal to the constitution of their country, as long as it remains the legal government, whatever its form. She forbids them, whatever the regimen under which they live, to be seditious or turbulent citizens, or to do any thing contrary to Christian charity. She teaches that unjust laws are violences rather than laws, and do not bind the conscience, and that always and everywhere we are to obey God rather than men; but that to avoid the danger of turbulence or sedition, from a just regard for the peace and order of society, love to our neighbor or our country, we may often be bound to obey even unjust laws, if they only require us to suffer wrong. Yet if they require us to do wrong, or what God forbids, we are by no means to obey them, but to suffer martyrdom rather, as did the early Christians under the heathen emperors. What the church really opposes, anathematizes, if you will, is neither popular government nor legal efforts to introduce and establish it, but efforts to introduce and establish it by unlawful means, by the crimes of sedition, insur-

rection, rebellion, or violent revolution—crimes which strike at all law, all civil justice, and render all orderly and stable government impracticable. She holds it as wrong to conspire to overthrow the existing government by violence in the name of the people, as in the name of monarchy or aristocracy."

This, I confess, struck me as a fair view of the case. If we hold that a certain portion of the people of a nation may, when they choose, conspire against the legally existing government, and by rebellion and civil war overthrow it, we take from law its sacredness and inviolability, and render all government, except that of mere brute force, impossible. The people have, undoubtedly, the right to reform, amend, modify, or change their institutions as they see proper, but only by such means as the existing law or constitution authorizes or does not prohibit, as under our American system.

I could never understand why sedition, insurrection, rebellion, should be less criminal under or for a democracy than under or for a monarchy. Obedience to law is as much a duty under a republican as under any other form of government. If not, on what ground can the general government pretend to justify the war it lately waged for the suppression of the revolt of the southern states, especially since those states did not defend their secession from the Union on the ground of the "sacred right of insurrection," or revolution, as La Fayette calls it. In nearly all cases, the act of insurrection or rebellion against the national authority is the act of a disappointed or turbulent minority, making itself formidable by secret combinations and underground operations. Their aim is to make their will override that of the majority. Their leaders seldom attain to power without proving themselves detestable tyrants, cruel, greedy, and selfish monsters. But the imperturbable editor proceeded on the maxim of all successful journalism, "whether convinced or not, never own that you are in the wrong."

III.—"Then again, went on the able editor, as if the priest had said nothing, "your church is undeniably at war with all modern civilization. You see it in the papal encyclical of 1864, with its appended syllabus of condemned errors. All those liberal-minded and enlightened Catholics who partake somewhat of the spirit of the nineteenth cen-

tury, disapprove the retrograde policy of the *oscurantisti*, and seek to effect a reconciliation between the church and modern ideas, or between her and our advanced and ever advancing civilization, are, if not absolutely under the ban of the ecclesiastical authorities, looked upon with distrust, held to be dangerous men, and false, if not to the doctrines, at least to the spirit of the church. To call a member of your church a liberal, is little less damaging to his character than to call him a heretic. Every advance in modern civilization has been effected not only without the aid of the church, but in spite of her most strenuous resistance."

"Mind the categories, my dear Editor. Such things are a little vague, and must be defined before one can say precisely what they are or are not. Will you tell me precisely what you understand, first by civilization, and second, by modern civilization?"

"Civilization is one of those terms which are more easily understood than defined. It needs no defining."

"To lend itself to vague declamation, certainly not. But you and I are not declaiming; we are endeavoring to look seriously and dispassionately at things as they are. Words are nothing except in their meaning, and their meaning is worthless or worse, if not clear, distinct, fixed, and definite. Civilization is a word of recent coinage, and its meaning is vague, loose and floating. It hardly means the same thing to any two minds. It was at first a court term, and a civilized person meant one who had the manners and breeding of the court; it was next used to designate, by way of extension, the town-bred, or, as Shakespeare calls it, 'inland-bred,' as distinguished from the country-bred, or rustics and clowns; but gradually, without losing entirely its relation to polite or urbane manners, it has come, in most modern languages, to mean the political and social order which stands opposed to barbarism, and includes ideas, manners, polity, government, laws, arts, sciences, and religion. Its essential meaning may be determined either by ascertaining the essential element of barbarism to which it is directly opposed, or by analyzing the nations generally recognized as civilized, and ascertaining their essential and distinctive principle.

"The essence or the distinctive principle of barbarism, I take it," continued the priest, "is the domination of will directed by passion; the distinctive or essential principle of civilization, as I understand it, is the government of will

directed by reason, or power obeying the dictates of justice. The barbarian state is that in which the government is force exercised by the lawless will, the caprice, the unrestrained passions of the chief, who holds the power as his own indefeasible right, and uses it at and for his own pleasure alone. In the civilized state the supreme political power vests in the nation, and the chief magistrate, be he called king, emperor, or president, and all subordinate officers, hold their power as a trust to be exercised for the public or common good. All despotic states are therefore to be classed as barbarian, and all civilized states as republican in principle. The distinction between barbarism and civilization, is simply the distinction between despotism and liberty, or republicanism, taking the word *republican* in its radical or etymological sense, correctly translated by your English word *commonwealth*. Now when and where does the church oppose, or ever has she opposed civilization in the sense I have defined?"

"Your definition is not broad enough to include all that is commonly understood by civilization. We commonly include in it refinement of manners, mental and moral culture, the fine arts, and the sciences."

"My definition does not exclude them, but those are all to be found in a greater or less degree in both ancient and modern nations not usually, if ever, counted among civilized nations. All I have pretended to do is to give the distinctive character or mark of civilization, and that is liberty, the supremacy of law, or power directed and controlled by justice or reason, not by arbitrary will directed and controlled by passion. But be this as it may, we have already seen that the church opposes none of the things which you pretend my definition does not include. She refined and softened the manners and humanized the sentiments of the barbarians who overthrew the Roman empire, as you yourself have admitted, and I have challenged you to name the science she opposes. I have shown you that she favors education and general intelligence by all the means in her power, and even you will not pretend that she has not been the great patron of the fine arts. If you should attempt to do it, her grand cathedrals, which the nations that have renounced her communion cannot even copy, and the magnificent pictures that adorn her churches, would soon reduce you to silence. The fact is, and everybody knows it, that all the civilized nations of Europe, indeed, all the civilized

nations now existing on the face of the globe, have received their civilization from her, and owe it to the patient and often misunderstood labors of her pontiffs, her priests, her religious, and her faithful people, giving form and expression to the faith and charity living and working in them. Pray tell me what there is, then, in modern civilization, that she opposes?"

"She opposes all that is peculiar to it, and constitutes its glory."

"The distinguishing feature of modern civilization, if we take what is positive in it, is the application of the discoveries of science to the mechanic and productive arts. Has she opposed this application? Does she condemn the use of the steam-engine, the spinning-jenny and spinning-mule, or the power-loom, the steamboat, the railroad, the locomotive, or the lightning telegraph; mowing, reaping, threshing, or winnowing machines; steam-ploughs, iron-clads, and the like?"

"The pope for a long time resisted, I believe, the construction of railroads in the pontifical states."

"As temporal sovereign he may have done so, and he doubtless had his reasons, good or bad; but has he ever condemned the construction of railroads and the use of locomotives as prohibited by the Christian faith, or declared them forbidden by the law of God?"

"I am not aware that he has."

"Then he has not opposed them as head of the church; and what he may or may not have opposed as head of the state is nothing to me, who am not his temporal subject. Since railroads, steamboats, and the various applications of science to the invention and construction of labor-saving machinery have been introduced, and the modern world is adjusted to them, we could not well do without them, and it would be a calamity to be deprived of them; but there are grave thinkers who greatly doubt if real civilization has been advanced by them, or if the world gets on any better with than it did without them. They have completely changed the face of the industrial world, to some extent the mutual relations of capital and labor, and vastly increased the power of production; but that they have made it easier for a poor man to earn his living, or added any thing to the real happiness or well-being of the people, is not so certain. Under the new system, the rich as a class grow richer, and the poor as a class grow poorer. The

small home industries of the olden time give way to large industries, in which capital, as necessary to introduce machinery, counts for more, and labor for less. Wages may be nominally higher, but are less in proportion to the wants of the laborer."

"You do not agree with the political economists, who tell us a very different story."

"The political economists consider man only as a producing, distributing, and consuming machine, and seek only to get the greatest possible supply with the greatest possible demand. I, by my profession, if not by my sympathy with my fellow-men, am led to look upon man as having a sentient, intellectual, and moral nature, and I seek for him the greatest possible sum of virtue and happiness. It is not likely, then, that the political economists and I should think alike. It adds not to the well-being of the poor that the aggregate wealth of a nation increases, if they are all the time growing poorer, and find it every day more difficult to supply their wants, or to obtain by honest industry their bread. Under the new system, it may be that wealth increases, but the tendency in the great industral nations is to concentrate it in fewer hands, or in huge over-grown corporations, which in your country are stronger than the government, and control, not always the elections, but the legislative assemblies, both state and national.

"I was taught," continued the priest, "that to make a man happy we should study not to increase his stores, but to diminish his desires. The political economists study to increase a man's desires, and to develop new wants in him, in order to increase as much as possible consumption, which, in turn, will increase the demand, and the increased demand will stimulate increased production. The demand creates the supply, and the supply stimulates consumption, which, in turn, creates an increased demand. This, if I understand it, is the essence of your modern science of political economy. But what is the gain to the laborer?"

"He is better fed, better clothed, better lodged than he was under the old system. He can satisfy more wants, and the more wants one satisfies, the more one enjoys."

"The more wants one has that one is unable to satisfy, the more one suffers. A man's happiness does not consist in the number of wants satisfied, but in having no wants unsatisfied. It may well be conceded that if the laboring classes were thrown back into the condition in which they

were in the middle ages, or even in the sixteenth century, they would be far more wretched than they are now; but that is not the question. Were their means of satisfaction less, in proportion to their actual wants, then than they are now, in proportion to their present actual wants? No doubt more wants may now be satisfied, but that is nothing, if there is a proportionate increase of wants that are not and cannot be satisfied."

"Do you contend that the proportion between the wants and the means of satisfying them has been diminished under the wonderful development of commerce and industry since the beginning of the present century?"

"Between what were the wants of the working-men in former times, and their present means of satisfying them, no; but between their present wants and the means of supplying them, yes. This is an age of forgetfulness. You seem to forget that no longer ago than 1848 nearly all European society was convulsed by the loud demand for what was then called the 'right to labor,' the right to gain one's bread by the sweat of one's face. Thousands, millions even, of men in the great industrial and commercial nations, able and willing to work, were standing idle, gaunt and grim, because there was no work to be had. The labor market was overstocked; supply had outrun the demand. The demand for labor depends on the state of the markets throughout the world, and a surplus of labor is the normal state in all your great industrial and commercial centres. Were the whole productive force at the command of industry employed to its full extent, more could be produced in any one year than could be disposed of to the actual consumer in any four years, as I am told by those who profess to know, and consequently the operatives are either thrown out of employment or compelled to work on short time for what is equivalent to three out of every four years. Hence the frequency of distress in manufacturing districts, which finds relief only in public or private charity. Various expedients are suggested by political economists, and tried by governments, but as yet with indifferent success. A favorite measure with one class is what is called protection, or a tax imposed on the importation of foreign productions for the protection and encouragement of our own. But this does not help the operative class; for its only effect is to increase the profits of the capital employed in the industries protected, and these enhanced profits must be paid by labor, or, at best, by labor and land."

"But the wiser class of political economists reject the protective system, and defend free trade."

"I do not know whether the free traders or the protectionists are the wiser; I only know that neither can remedy the evil. Free trade simply gives the advantage to those nations that have already got the start of the others in the production of exchangeable commodities. Its maxim is to buy where you can buy cheapest, and to sell where you can sell dearest, and its interest is therefore to enhance as much as possible the profits of capital by diminishing the cost of labor, and therefore the value to the laborer of his labor, the only commodity he has to dispose of. The only difference I can see between the two systems is, that the protective system taxes the land and labor of the nation that adopts it, and the free trade system taxes the land and labor of all trading nations for the benefit of capital, especially of the capital of the nation that has already the start of the others. Free trade is, undoubtedly, the interest of British capital, for Great Britain is the greatest manufacturing and commercial nation in the world; and perhaps for the United States, so largely engaged in the production of agricultural staples and raw materials. Free trade between Great Britain and France, Spain, Germany, Italy, would operate to the advantage of British capital. Besides, trade itself creates a competition for the markets of the world, which originates nearly all the wars of modern times, and necessitates those large standing armies of European states which are such a heavy burden on land and labor."

"But the reverend father himself is forgetful; he forgets that commerce is the grand civilizer of nations; that it brings all nations into communion with one another, and binds them together by one and the same interest."

"I am no enemy to commerce, but I should be much obliged to you if you would name to me a single barbarous or semi-barbarous people, in either ancient or modern times, that commerce has civilized."

"The great commercial nations of the world are precisely those which are called civilized nations, which proves that commerce and civilization go together."

"The statement is rather too broad. Ancient Rome was not a commercial nation. France has never been predominantly commercial; nor Germany, either of the North or of the South. But let that pass. That the great commercial nations have been and are civilized nations, and that they

have extended the area of civilization by establishing colonies of emigrants from their own bosom, is undoubtedly true; but the point is, has commerce ever civilized a nation it found on opening trade with it uncivilized? I recollect no instance of the kind. As far as my historical reading goes, the only force that has ever civilized a savage, barbarous, or semi-barbarous tribe or people, is religion. Commerce brings civilized and uncivilized nations in contact, no doubt, but as a rule the uncivilized are broken, as the earthen pot that comes in contact with the iron pot. What has the commerce of Great Britain done for India, where civilization was once far superior to what it is now? Great Britain, and perhaps other Christian nations, have gained by it, but India herself has lost her autonomy and been impoverished by it. The people of India are poorer to-day, find it harder to live, than when the English East India Company was formed. England, to obtain a market for her own wares, broke up the native manufactures, and reduced the poor people to abject dependence. The same process has been begun with China and Japan, though it may not be so successful there as it has been in India, where the natives have thus far deteriorated, and in no sense advanced in civilization. Commerce has only one principle—'to buy cheap and sell dear;' it does not concern itself with civilization."

"Then you would annihilate commerce, break up our labor-saving machinery, destroy our steamboats and railroads, and go back to the ox-team, the spinning-wheel, and the hand-loom—back to the dark ages. That is the spirit of your religion. Said I not true, then, that your church opposes progress and resists modern civilization?"

"Not at all. I am not arguing against progress, but simply endeavoring to show that some things so called, may, after all, not deserve that respectable name. I propose no going back to former industrial arrangements. True, I do not believe all is gold that glisters, nor that the people are really any better off under the new system than they were before it was adopted; but since it is adopted, and habits and modes of action are conformed and adjusted to it, we could not dispense with it without causing a far greater evil than was caused by its introduction and adoption. The church can use your railroads and steamboats for her missionaries, and your lightning telegraphs for rapid communication between her head and members. If it was no advantage to make the change, it still would be a great disadvantage to

be forced to return to the past. The church may, as a question of human prudence, regard certain changes as unadvisable, but if they leave her full fredom of action for herself, and do not conflict with faith, or with what in her discipline is unalterable without serious detriment to its efficiency, she, when they are once effected, accepts them as facts, and adjusts her modes of action to them."

I was not prepared to agree or even disagree with the priest in his views of the comparative merits of the modern industrial system, or, as Nicholas of Russia called it, "the mercantile system," which was inaugurated by the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, and at the head of which stands Great Britain; but as he evidently spoke his own views on the subject, not in the name of the church, I could see nothing in them that committed her against modern civilization. Many facts occurred to me in favor of the priest's views. Under the olden system the people often suffered from famine, occasioned by short crops, by war, and by pestilence, which always follows a dearth of provisions; but I am not aware that when there was plenty in the land, any one who was able and willing to work must starve, because he could find no work to do. I recalled the fact that so often struck me in my foreign travels, that the greatest distress among the operatives, and the most squalid wretchedness that came under my eye, I invariably found in the leading industrial and commercial nations. Nowhere did I find the extremes of wealth and poverty so striking as in Great Britain. The wealth of her nobility was often great, but that was in most cases, due to the enhanced value of their landed estates, and led to no painful reflections. But the huge wealth of her merchant princes, her cotton or industrial lords, her bankers and money-changers, contrasted sadly with the mighty mass of pauperism, every day increasing, and supported by rates levied on householders, themselves often but a shade above the pauper. I could not but think, by what a terrible tax on the laboring classes their enormous wealth must have been accumulated. Their wealth has been gained at the expense not only of the laboring class of their own country, but at the expense of the laboring classes of British India, and of all nations against which Great Britain holds the balance of trade. It has been gained by coining the toil, the sweat, the tears, and the blood of millions; and what can I say in defence of the system that permits, encourages, nay, demands for its success, such gross outrages upon our fellow-men?

I see the same system adopted in my own country, whose prosperity, up to the breaking out of the late civil war, was due to three principal causes—the large tracts of fertile land, easily accessible, and cheap; to southern slavery, which stimulated the production of cotton; and the mighty influx into the non-slaveholding states of foreign laborers. To these, and not to our democratic institutions, nor to any wise legislation, state or national, which has from the first been about as unwise, as shortsighted, and as blundering as it well could be, do we owe our prosperity. Slavery is abolished, the public lands are remote from the great centres of population, and the best and richest of them have been given away to great corporations, and the British system, before the war confined mostly to the northern states, and against which the confederate states waged their disastrous war, can now spread over the whole Union, and produce, in time, more fatal results than in England, for it meets here no counterpoise in a landed aristocracy, and the government operates simply as its agent or instrument.

We declaim against feudalism, under which the great vassals of the crown were more powerful than the crown itself, and often reduced the central authority to a legal fiction. How much better is it with us, where the effective power is vested in huge railroad and other corporations? The government, both state and national, is only the factor of these corporations, which, though its own creations, it cannot control but must obey.

These and other considerations make it impossible for me to say the priest was wrong; and yet, a man of the nineteenth century, I hardly dare hint, even to myself, the possibility of his being right. It is true, I have an aversion to trade, and never find any music in the clack of the cotton-mill, but I have not the courage to think that what almost every man I meet boasts as a miracle of progress, can possibly be no progress at all.

IV.—The conversation was interrupted, as the priest made his last remark on the modern industrial or mercantile system, by an unexpected arrival, at our quiet watering-place, of a fashionable lady, with two marketable—I beg pardon, two marriageable daughters, and was not resumed for several days. The lady had been misinformed, and was much disappointed in not finding our mountain spa a fashionable watering-place. It is true, the guests were all

gentlemen, but unhappily, all except the priest and myself were married. The priest was old, and besides was bound, as a priest, to celibacy, and I was, for reasons of my own, no marrying man. The mother was pleasant, amiable, chatty, and the daughters were charming, and we were sorry to have them leave us. But they concluded the waters would not agree with them, and on the morning of the third day after their arrival, they left us for Saratoga. Their departure took from us a ray of sunshine, and cast a sombre hue for a little while over our lonely village, and indisposed us to listen to the grave discussions between the priest and the progressive journalist.

But several days after the departure of our lady guests, the editor and priest resumed their conversations in the usual place. As I drew near, I heard the priest say:

"After all, my dear Journalist, what in modern civilization, that is manifestly a progress, do you pretend the church opposes and condemns?"

"She condemns the very ideas and principles on which modern civilization is based, such as the dignity and worth of human nature, the perfectibility of the species, the inalienable right of every man to think for himself and to be exempt from all obligation in religion, morals, or politics, to obey, or even to consult any authority but his own reason and judgment, and the doctrine that no one is bound to obey any government but such as claims no powers not derived from the consent of the governed."

"With regard to the dignity and worth of human nature, she probably rates them somewhat higher than you do, for she teaches that God assumed human nature into hypostatic union with himself, and made it his own nature, without its ceasing to be distinctively and properly human nature. With regard to the perfectibility of the species, I will only say that she teaches that man can be regenerated and supernaturalized, and that he is not only perfectible, but by grace can attain to perfection, to the actualization of all the possibilities of his nature. With regard to reason and authority, she requires every man to retain and exercise his reason to the fullest extent, and she demands obedience to no authority that is not reasonable. As to government or power, she teaches with St. Paul and all sound philosophy, that *non est potestas nisi a Deo*, there is no power but from God. Do you not agree with St. Paul?"

"I hold with the American congress of 1776, and the immortal Jefferson."

"Jefferson was, I doubt not, a sincere and earnest American patriot, a skillful diplomatist, and a very distinguished man; but I hardly think you would be willing to publish in your journal that you hold the author of the Declaration of American Independence to be higher authority than the great doctor of the gentiles and author of the Epistle to the Romans. The American congress of 1776 was, I have always understood, a highly respectable body of men, deserving to be held in high honor by their countrymen. As a naturalized American citizen, I respect their act, but in case they put forth doctrines that conflict with the teachings of St. Paul, I must beg leave to consider the apostle, who taught by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as the higher authority."

"You then differ from the American congress?"

"I must obey God rather than men, and the authority of the apostle overrides any and every human authority. The opinions or theories put forth in the Declaration of Independence, form no part of the American constitution, or of American law, and I can reject them, if I see reason for so doing, without committing any act of disloyalty to the American state. The principles asserted in the preamble to the Declaration, I presume, are to be interpreted by the act they are intended to justify, and I see no right that you or I have to give them a broader sense than the occasion demanded. The congress were about to declare the Anglo-American colonies they represented absolved from their allegiance to the British crown, and to be free and independent states, and all they needed to affirm was, that every government derives its just powers from the consent of the people who are to be governed, or to live under it, not from the will or might of a foreign nation, prince, or potentate. This I do not deny; for I hold, with the great body of Catholic theologians, that power is under God a trust from the people or nation; but if you understand the congress to mean that no government has any power to govern any individual except by his personal consent, or that the government derives its just powers from the people in their individual and personal capacity, I must differ widely from it. The law derives its force as law from the law-giver, and from the people only in the sense in which they make the law, which certainly is not in their personal and individual capacity. The court will hardly permit the murderer to plead that he has never consented to the law under which

he is to be tried or that declares murder a crime, and that he refuses his assent to the penalty it requires to be inflicted on those who commit it. Such a plea, if admitted, would very soon put an end to all courts of criminal jurisdiction, to all government, indeed, and leave every man to live as he lists. I cannot, however, believe that the American congress ever meant any thing so anti-social and absurd. As I understand it, there is no conflict between it and St. Paul."

"I want no better proof than this, that the church opposes the essential principle of modern civilization. She denies, as you virtually concede, that government derives all its just powers from the governed, and therefore asserts its right to govern me without my consent. She therefore denies the sovereignty of the people."

"The sovereignty of the individual, or of the people as individuals, most certainly; of the people collectively understood, or the people as the community, by no means. In this latter sense, the sovereignty of the people, the political people, is nothing peculiar to modern civilization, but has always been asserted by all civilized nations, and is, as we have seen, the distinctive principle of civilization itself; the former, which is, in principle, only a phase of despotism, has never been asserted or submitted to by any civilized people on earth. That there is in most modern states a party more or less numerous that plead it in justification of their conspiracies, insurrections, rebellions, or revolutionary movements against legally existing governments, I do not deny; but this doctrine forms the basis of no modern state, and even these, when they attain to power, are forced to abandon it. You mistake as the actual basis of modern civilization, the principle which a party is everywhere struggling to make its basis, but which is as yet not so made."

"The state with us is confessedly founded on these principles—on the sacred right of insurrection, rebellion, revolution."

"I think not; I find no such right recognized or provided for in the constitution. I find treason recognized as a high crime, and generally punishable with death. That even the American people do not practically hold the principles you allege, is evident from their recent war in vindication of the Union against armed secession. Whether the secession of states is rebellion or not, depends on the fact whether American sovereignty vests in the states severally, or in the states united. If the former be the fact, secession

is no rebellion, is only the exercise, saving the breach of faith, of a right inherent in each of the several states, and never surrendered to the Union; if in the states united, the confederates, in making war on the Union, were rebels. In which vests the sovereignty I am not the authority to decide. The church gave her sacraments to men on either side alike; but the American people, as represented by the government, called secession rebellion, and put it down by armed force, and thus proved that they are very far from conceding, in any practical sense, that government can rightfully exercise no power not derived from the consent of the governed. On the principle you contend for, not only states but individuals may secede or withdraw themselves from the government whenever they please, or find it convenient. If your interpretation of the Declaration of Independence is the true one, the war against secession was wholly indefensible. But I am aware of no government that does not assert its right of self-preservation against any and every class of assailants, whether from within or from without."

"I do not deny the right of self-defence to the government, or its right to put down rebellion, or suppress revolt."

"Therefore, you concede the authority of the nation, and deny that of the individual citizen, or of any combination of individual citizens, to rebel against it or to resist it, and abandon, very properly, the principle that government has no just powers not derived from the personal consent of the individuals governed; for it cannot be pretended that they who resist or rebel against the government consent to it."

"Modern civilization is not so much the civilization that actually obtains, as that to which the modern world is tending, or that is struggling to be the civilization of the future. There is much of the leaven of the past still retained in the present, which must be cast out, before it can become actual."

"It is no insignificant fact that the party which wars against the church is always the party of the future, and never attains, but is always just a-going to attain to the good it seeks. Your modern civilization is something that is just a-going to be effected."

"That is because men and society are infinitely progressive. They pursue and struggle to realize an ideal that is always just above and before them, and which recedes as they advance. No individual ever overtakes his ideal. The individual is finite, the ideal is infinite. The greatness, the

glory of man, is not that he is perfect, but that he is infinitely perfectible; is always nearing perfection, but never reaching it—in the fact that there are no limits to his progress. His happiness is not in the quarry, but in the chase."

"I am parched with thirst; I see the waters of the cool, bubbling spring; I run towards it; it recedes; and the faster, the faster I run. I am faint with hunger; before me is a table spread with rich viands and precious fruits; I hasten towards it, it recedes as I advance, and keeps always in sight, but just beyond my reach, and never a morsel can I obtain. This is the happiness you promise me, the glory of my nature, of which you speak, and the advanced civilization you condemn the church for not approving! Why, my dear friend, you offer me as heaven what the Greeks imagined to be hell, and proffer me as bliss what they thought was the severest punishment to which armipotent and triumphant Jove could doom the defeated giant Tantalus."

"You seem to forget, Reverend Father, that a poet of your own church, if I mistake not, has sung,

> 'Hope springs eternal in the human breast,
> Man never is, but always to be blest.'"

"No, I forget not; but I need something more than rhyme, whether I am to take it gravely or satirically, to persuade me that it is happiness never to be happy, a blessing never to be blest, to hunger and thirst and never be filled. A greater than the poet Pope said, 'Blessed are ye that hunger and thirst after justice, for ye *shall be satisfied*.' Hope is a great consoler, but I do not understand how there can be hope where there is full assurance that fruition is impossible. There would be despair, not hope. Sweet is repose after labor, and the hope of obtaining it makes the labor light. But when you tell me the labor will be eternally in vain, that the hour of repose will never come, that there remaineth no rest after toil, no calm after the storm, no peace after the war, you deprive me of heart and hope, and make life a weary burden, too heavy to be borne."

"But the labor is not in vain. It is in the labor, in the chase, in the effort, in the struggle, in the battle that the powers of the mind, and soul, and body are developed and strengthened."

"To what end? What avail the development, the strengthening, the growth of our faculties, when there is no matu-

rity for them, no end to be gained? It is only the hope of winning that stimulates us to labor, and sustains us under our fatigue. Your doctrine deprives us of hope, by teaching us that it is an illusion. That your doctrine of progress is false you might infer from the very fact that to effect it an illusion is necessary. Take away the illusion of hope, and you render every effort impossible. Can that be true which is possible only by an illusion, a falsehood?"

It seemed to me that here the priest had the better of the editor. I had early been divested of all my illusions; I no longer saw any thing to gain, and had ceased to make any effort; my mind and affections became stagnant, and I vegetated under an intolerable lassitude and weariness of life rather than lived. I had adopted, without much reflection, the modern doctrine of perfectibility, or indefinite progress. While its novelty lasted and the illusions of youth were undissipated by experience, I was active, and exerted my faculties in various directions. I found pleasure in activity; in the effort, in the chase, and said the happiness is in striving to attain, not in the attainment. Possession dispels the illusion; nothing turns out to be what we expected; we turn away wearied and disgusted from the possession of that which we had moved heaven and earth to gain. But when the illusion is once dispelled by experience, and we see no object of pursuit large enough to fill the soul, to satisfy all its wants, and afford it ever fresh delight, we cease to exert ourselves. I became apathetic, took no interest in any thing, and looked upon all pursuits, pleasures, pains, hopes, and fears of my fellow-men, with listless indifference. One thing was as good as another; all was vanity. *Vanitas vanitatum, et omnia vanitas.* My life had no object, no aim, no purpose, and I thought only of how to tide over the present hour.

The priest startled me by showing me that those who placed, as I had done, the good in always pursuing an ideal, and never attaining it, simply mistake hell for heaven. All the torture, the agony of soul, all the tragedy of life, comes from unrealized ideals. The age in which we live, perhaps more than any other, is in pursuit of ideals never to be realized. Hence its restlessness, its agitation, its frivolity, its feebleness, its abasement of character, its ill-at-ease, its craving for stimulants of all sorts, for body, mind, and soul. O, if one could only fully believe him who says, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will

give you rest;" "Blessed are ye who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for ye shall be filled;" "Blessed are ye that mourn, for ye shall be comforted." O, is it true that there remaineth a rest for the soul!

V.—The priest replied, "You are right, my dear Editor, in saying man is progressive, and in holding that the ideal which floats above and before him, and draws him upward and onward, is infinite. It is infinite; and we are finite. However near to it we may advance, or however near to us it may be, it is always infinitely above and beyond us. You touch here, without knowing it, the great mystery of human life, and which is inexplicable to all men who have hope only in this world, and see nothing beyond the grave. Have you ever asked yourself what that ideal is? Is it real? Is it a vain illusion? Is it a creation of your own fancy? Is it your own mind projected? or, is it the real end for which you are created, to which the soul so nobly aspires, and without union with which she can neither attain the complement of her nature, or the beatitude she craves?"

"Your question is metaphysical, and I eschew metaphysics. The moment a man enters into the field of metaphysics, he loses himself in a dense fog, in which he can neither see nor be seen. I make it a rule to give the metaphysicians and theologians a wide berth. I am contented with practical common sense, and deal only with realities. I am of Anglo-Saxon descent."

"Your Anglo-Saxon ancestors are doubtless proud of their gifted descendant. But the man who professes to regard it as a merit to eschew philosophy and theology, should studiously avoid raising questions which, in the nature of the case, only philosophy and theology can answer. You have all along been engaged in philosophy and theology, though it may be without being aware of it. You tell us there hovers ever before us an infinite ideal, which we are always striving to realize, but which forever eludes us. I think even Anglo-Saxon common sense can comprehend that this ideal is either something or nothing, and that, since it moves and agitates us, it can hardly be nothing. The same common sense, I think, must suffice to assure us that if it is infinite and we finite, it is something distinct from and independent of us, and not ourselves projected. The finite projected can be only finite. It is, then, no more

than a dictate of common sense, to conclude that the infinite ideal you assert is and can be only real and infinite being, that is, what philosophers and theologians call God, and that in her endless craving for the ideal, the soul has what old Cudworth would call a *prolepsis* of her end in God. Do you concede it?"

"I discuss no such questions, and therefore neither affirm nor deny any thing of the matter?"

"Well, respecting your ignorance, since you honestly avow it, permit me to say that a man's ideal must always be greater than he actually is, or otherwise it would be no ideal at all. An infinite ideal must be God, for he alone is infinite, and in him the ideal and the real, or the actual and the possible, are identical. The idea must be infinite, or man could not be infinitely progressive as you say he is. The soul in craving and seeking to possess the ideal, in which you place progress, craves and seeks to possess God in a sense that she does not as yet possess him. She now possesses God, lives and moves, and has her being in him as her Creator. The ideal is before us, not behind us; something to be approached, not recoiled from. The ideal is the end we are striving to realize, but which, you say, can never be realized or attained to. But the infinite ideal is God: God revealing himself, not as our maker, but as our end, our final cause, to whom we return, and in whom our progress finds its term. Say, then, not that we are infinitely progressive, but that we are progressive to the infinite, and that the soul cannot rest until it attains to the infinite God. Progress is not indefinite, then, but has a term, and that term is the infinite God, not, as you assume, an abstraction; and the infinite God is our final cause, as he is our first cause. When we have reached our end, we have attained, have found, possess our beatitude, and our progress terminates: for we have reached the infinite, and I think even you will concede that there is no advance beyond the infinite, and that the infinite is large enough to fill and satisfy the most hungry soul."

"But how do you prove that the infinite God is the term of our progress?"

"You eschew metaphysics, so I can only answer, that you assert that man is infinitely progressive; but this can only mean that he is progressive even to the infinite, to oneness with the infinite God, for we have before settled it that progress is motion forward, an advance towards an end?

Without a term to be reached, a goal to be attained, or at least to be aimed at, progress would be inconceivable, and there could be no forward or backward motion. Do not forget the illustration of the treadmill, or, if you please, that of a man trying to step on his own shadow. Remember that you cannot assert progress without asserting for it both a starting-point and a terminating point—a beginning and an end—therefore, my son, *aspice finem*, look to the end, which, through Christ the Mediator is, I dare assert, attainable, if you will, realizable."

"Grant the ideal is God, that God can fill the soul, yet we may never attain to him or realize our ideal: we may miss the realization."

"That is well said; for men are free agents, and it is to be feared that many do miss their end, fail to fulfil their destiny, by preferring the creature to the Creator, a finite to an infinite good, and by refusing to concur with the grace and to use the means necessary to gain it. These are, in the language of Christians, lost; are doomed to hell or the lower regions; but they are as lost in precisely the condition which you assume is the normal condition of all men, that of pursuing forever an ideal which they can never realize or attain to; of seeking and never finding; doomed to hunger and thirst without ever being filled; to crave what they have not, and to see it always elude them, and to be deprived of all hope of ever attaining it. They are in what you call heaven, but in what Christians call hell; they are, according to you, manifesting the greatness, the dignity, and the glory of human nature; but to the Christian they are 'clouds without water, which are carried about by the winds; trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion; wandering stars to whom the storm of darkness [despair] is reserved forever,' as St. Jude describes them. They have failed of their destiny, and remain always below it, with the infinite Ideal, henceforth for them forever unrealizable, floating above and beyond their reach.

"You paint nothing, Reverend Father, to frighten me, and the condition you describe is, as far as I can see, no less bearable than our present condition, which I find so pleasant that I am loath to leave it."

"So I expected a true son of the nineteenth century to answer. But here you are sustained by hope; there all hope is left behind, and only black despair goes with you. Yet,

let me tell you, my young friend, that when you have lived to my age, and gone through what I have, you will not find your present pleasure in the effort, the struggle, the pursuit; you will be glad to find that the battle is one day to be over, that the victory is to be won, and that henceforth you may throw off your harness, for there is laid up for you a crown of life that fadeth not away, eternal in the heavens."

There was no sadness in the priest's tones; his face wore a smile of victory, and it was evident that he was looking forward, with joy unspeakable, to the hour when he should be released and welcomed to the eternal home where was his love. I looked at him as he ceased speaking, and asked myself, is it possible that faith is something more than opinion, and Christianity something more than a theorem for philosophers? Here the conversation ended for the day, and I sought solitude, that I might reflect on the great questions which it had raised in my mind in spite of myself.

The metropolitan editor evidently was proof against any thing the priest could say, and if, for a moment he seemed, like King Agrippa, to be almost persuaded on some points, he soon verified the old maxim—

> "Persuade a man against his will,
> He's of the same opinion still."

He amused himself, and whiled away the time by calling out the priest, whom he admired not for his deep earnestness, sincerity, and evident good faith, but as a skilful lawyer speaking from his brief. He himself probably had no very deep convictions of any sort. Like too many of his fraternity, he had never seriously thought for himself on any subject once in his life; he had simply inquired for the dominant opinion or tendency of his age, his country, his party, or his coterie, and supported it without raising the question whether it was right or wrong. He called it the will of the people, the voice of the people; and the voice of the people, you know, is the voice of God. He had taken up with the modern doctrine of progress, sneered at every thing old, and lauded every thing new. The priest, as an old man, who had seen many revolutions in states and empires, and had reflected much on what he had seen, was inclined to believe that all wisdom and virtue was not born with the nineteenth century, that "brave men lived before Agamemnon," and that the birth of the Saviour was a greater

event for the human race than the French revolution of 1789.

VI.—The next day the priest did not make his appearance. It was, as I afterwards learned, the anniversary of a sad event in his memory, when several of his near relatives and dear friends were massacred while endeavoring to protect their church and its altar from desecration by a band of revolutionists. The editor spent the day with one or two of his friends in rambling over the green hills and climbing the mountains in pursuit of the picturesque; the rest of us congregated at the usual place, under the huge old maples and beeches, and conversed among ourselves on the ideas advanced by the priest. The general sympathy, as a matter of course, was with the editor, only most of the guests thought he pushed his views of progress a little too far, and that in some of his notions he was too transcendental; but all dissented *in toto*, except perhaps myself, from the priest's political economy. His doctrine, if true, would strip the present century of its special glory. What! intimate that the present industrial system operates to break up small home industries, and to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer! It was downright treason, nay blasphemy, for it blasphemed the works of genius, and genius is divine.

The day after, the editor resumed the discussion with the priest, though on a different point.

"You and your church, Reverend Father, make too little of the progress of liberty in your estimate of modern civilization. Civil liberty has made and is making immense progress."

"In imperial France, imperial Austria, autocratic Russia, despotic Prussia, aristocratic England, oppressed Ireland, new-fangled Italy, revolutionary Spain, and anarchical Spanish America?"

"In the United States we have a republic based on the principle of the equality of all men without regard to race or complexion."

"A principle proclaimed more than eighteen centuries ago, by the church of God, embodied in the civil law, and always acted on and realized in the church herself, or the commonwealth of Christ. The church has never known any distinction of race or complexion, and she has always had the same service for the master and the servant, and the same law and the same discipline for the prince and the peasant.

The United States, I hope I may say without offence, are not the whole world, and their political principles are practically adopted by no other nation. I own you are a great people, but you have at best only applied, in the political order, the principles the church has always taught and insisted on. If I am not misinformed, it is even yet doubtful if the no-distinction policy between the white race and the colored races—black, red, and yellow—will be sustained by a majority of the American people. You are in the midst of a struggle, the result of which is, as yet, uncertain. It is not many years since you held, in round numbers, four millions of people, out of thirty-one millions, in slavery, and treated them as chattels. It is too soon to boast of your progress in liberty."

"But Russia has emancipated her serfs."

"Very true: at least what is called emancipating them; but, as I read history, there were no serfs in Russia till near the beginning of the sixteenth century. The autocracy, due to the usurper, Peter the Great, remains, and the progress effected is, at best, only a partial return to the liberty enjoyed in Russia prior to the date of what you call modern civilization."

"Count you for nothing the fact that both Prussia and Austria have become constitutional states, with parliamentary governments?"

"It is only to-day that they have become so. As yet the Prussian constitution is only a paper constitution, and practically the government is a military despotism, as much so as under Frederic II. The Austrian constitution has hardly as yet got into working order, and I have not been able to discover in it any guaranty for any greater liberty to the people than they have previously enjoyed. Von Beust governs as absolutely as did Prince Kaunitz, with whom Austria's misfortunes began. You count, I presume, the extinction of the once great and free kingdom of Poland by Prussia, Russia, and Austria as a progress of freedom. The rights and independence of nations do not seem to have any connection in the modern political mind with liberty."

"Italy, long divided into petty states, held in tutelage by despotic Austria and the no less despotic pope, and reduced to a mere geographical expression, has been, with the exception of the city of Rome and its adjacent territory, emancipated politically from the despotism of both, and united into a single state under a liberal monarchy and a popular

constitution. She now belongs to herself, and is one of the great powers of Europe. Is that nothing?"

"The events that have occurred in the Italian peninsula are of too recent a date to afford you any solid argument. What is to be the future of the Italian peninsula, I do not pretend to foretell; your so-called kingdom of Italy is in the process of formation rather than definitely formed, and Italian statesmen are attempting to found it in iniquity, by the violation of international law, or the disregard of vested rights, and the suppression of the freedom and independence of sovereign states. I have no faith in paper or parchment constitutions, or constitutions which are drawn up with 'malice aforethought,' and which have no support in the habits and traditions of the people who are to live under them. Such constitutions can be upheld only by military force, and no government upheld only by military force, with no moral hold on the people, is likely to work well, or to stand a long time. Italy, for more reasons than one, is very dear to me, and I cannot wish her ill; but as yet the Italian people are practically less free, and far more heavily taxed, than they were under their legitimate princes, who have been so violently and iniquitously dispossessed."

"But while we are talking, news comes of a revolution in Spain and the expulsion of Isabella Segunda, and a free republic or a constitutional monarchy will be established by the free action of the Spanish people. Surely that is a progress of liberty."

"I know not that. There is a strong republican party in the large Spanish towns, but the great majority of the population of the country are attached to monarchy, and if left free will vote for a king. The government overthrown was a parliamentary government, a constitutional monarchy. Spain is my native country, and the news distresses me. I never acknowledged Isabella for my sovereign, for she had by Spanish law no right to the Spanish throne; but I credit none of the rumors against her character as a woman or as a queen. She has fallen a victim to the revolutionary spirit of the day, not because she was immoral, tyrannical, or capricious, but because she loved the church and sympathized with the Holy Father in his manifold troubles, and perhaps because a brother-in-law wanted her crown. Spain was once a free state, the freest in Europe, till she fell under Austrian sovereigns, who destroyed her comuneros, and reduced her nobles to mere courtiers. Each of her provinces and

towns had its fueros, its rights and privileges, which even her Austrian and Bourbon kings respected, but which revolutions professedly in favor of popular freedom have swept away. For the last few years, under the government of Isabella and the cortes, she has been rapidly recovering from the abyss into which thirty years of revolution and disorder had plunged her; her trade and industry have been reviving, internal improvements encouraged, religion—as far as the queen's power extended—fostered, and the day seemed not distant when she would proudly resume in the European congress of nations her place as a great power. What is in store for her in the future, I know not; I fear it is only anarchy, civil war, and a baser prostration. Cite her not, I pray you, as a proof of the progress of liberty, if you wish me to believe the liberty you talk of is a thing the church should bless, or from which civilization has any thing to hope. Do not force me to exclaim with Madame Roland, on her way to the scaffold, to which the revolution she had done so much to foment and to urge on in its devastating career, conducted her, 'O liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!' Yes, Dame Roland, you felt it, when your turn came to reap the fruit of your own sowing."

"But little as you think, Reverend Father, of the liberty gained by the people of Europe in this brave and generous struggle against the despotisms of kings and nobles, you cannot deny that they have emancipated themselves from the despotism of the pope, and broken the galling chains of the old union of church and state."

"The old union of church and state is dissolved, and no government now on earth, unless fallen Portugal be an exception, acknowledges its obligation of spiritual obedience to the vicar of Christ, the supreme pastor, teacher, and governor of the universal church; but whether that is a gain or a loss to liberty, to the state, or to the people, is another matter. The pope never claimed any temporal authority out of the states of the church, though he exercised for a time an arbitratorship of Christian nations, poorly replaced by your modern congresses and conferences of sovereigns; but that was an accident, and no essential element of the papacy. The nations, not the papacy, have suffered by the change. In all other respects the authority of the pope was spiritual, and the emancipation of the nations you boast is simply emancipation from the law of God, and the assertion of the independence of the secular order, or its freedom to

dispense with justice and morality in politics. I have yet to learn that the people have gained any thing by this sort of emancipation. Kings and princes have gained the power of violating all laws, human and divine, without exposing themselves to the spiritual discipline of the church. That is all that has been gained, as far as I can see. You are obliged to resort to revolution and bloody and disastrous civil war to effect now what once could generally be effected peaceably by a brief from the acknowledged spiritual head of Christendom. Even from your purely human point of view this seems to me more like a loss than a gain."

"I see the old spirit survives, and that those who oppose the spread of the church here on the ground of her incompatibility with the existence of our free institutions, and the sovereignty of the people, are right. You regret the lost union of church and state, and if you had the power you would reëstablish it here."

"That by no means follows: I may regret the passing away of things which I believe were in their day good and useful, and yet be very unwilling to restore them. The relation of the church to the state, which subsisted in the middle ages, I believe was a proper relation at that time, and served the interests both of religion and of society; but times have changed, and that relation is no longer practicable nor even desirable. Whether the changes that have taken place are for the better or for the worse, it is useless to inquire. They have taken place, and the church in fulfilling her divine mission takes the world where she finds it. She did not treat the feudal *régime* as she had treated the Roman imperial *régime*, nor will she treat the republican society of America as she did the feudal society of Europe, or the monarchical society that supplanted the feudal. She will assert here, as always and everywhere, the supremacy of the law of God, for states as for individuals, and the incompetency of the state in spirituals. Here and elsewhere, all she asks is protection in her free and independent performance of her own work, or in her freedom and independence in governing in spiritual matters her own children according to her own law. She can have no motive or disposition to change the constitution of your republic, for under it she has nearly all she ever struggled with the civil authorities of the Old World to obtain. The only thing she has any motive to strive for here is to prevent any fundamental change in the constitution and laws in regard to the relations of church and state."

"That sounds plausible enough, and is the proper thing for you to say here. Yet you know perfectly well, Reverend Father, that the church condemns those of her children who advocate the separation of church and state."

"Those she condemns are not those who mean by the separation of church and state the order established by the constitution of the American republic, but those who mean by it the absolute independence and supremacy of the secular order, the emancipation of the state from the law of God, its freedom to suppress the church whenever it finds her in the way of its ambition, its policy, its schemes of injustice against either its own subjects or against foreign states. In the Old World the separation of church and state means the supremacy of the state alike in spirituals and temporals, as in Russia, Prussia, Great Britain, and other states, or at least, the right of the state to define the boundaries of the church, and to enlarge or contract the sphere of her freedom at will. This right is claimed, is asserted for itself in every European state, and the state holds itself free to restrict the freedom of the church or to exclude her altogether, as it sees proper. This claim renders concordats or treaties between the church and the state necessary in order to secure to to the church some degree of freedom and independence. What the church condemns under the head of separation of church and state, is the independence of the state of the laws of God, the abrogation of these concordats, and the right of the state to abrogate them by its own authority without her consent, as has been done in the Italian states by the pretended kingdom of Italy, and more recently by Austria, which places the church at the mercy of the state. In your republic concordats are not necessary. The state disclaims all authority in spirituals, and by its fundamental law recognizes the independence and freedom of the spiritual order, and its obligation to protect and defend the church with all its power in the peaceable exercise of her spiritual freedom, which is more than the most favorable concordat has ever yet secured to her elsewhere. There is no country in the world where the church is or ever has been as free to govern her children according to her own discipline and laws, or where Pius IX. is so truly pope, as the United States. And this freedom is not held here as a grant from the state revocable at its will, but is the right of conscience of each and every citizen; one of those rights of man, or rather of God, which are antecedent to civil society,

and which government is instituted to protect and defend. Rome would have but a small share of that wisdom and sagacity she gets credit for, if she should seek or suffer her children to seek to substitute for this system any system which does or ever has obtained in the Old World."

"But this freedom which the church has here she has only in common with all religious denominations. With that she never has been and never will be satisfied. She would reign alone; and when she gets the power she will compel the state to suppress all religious denominations hostile to herself. Such is at least a fair inference from her past history."

"I think not. She has never had in the past a state of things such as obtains here, and therefore no inference of the kind can be drawn from her past history. The church is exclusive, intolerant, as is truth itself, in the theological order, but she is obliged by no doctrine or principle she holds, to exact from the state civil intolerance. She does not believe it a matter of indifference in regard to eternal salvation, or even in regard to civil society, whether a man believes truth or error; but she can very well consent, where she is free herself, where all her own rights are protected, and she stands on a footing of civil equality with the sects, that they should be before the state as free as herself. If the state gives them no advantage over her, she can get along very well without its giving her any advantage over them."

Here I confess the priest surprised me. Like the majority of my countrymen, I had supposed the church is innately and necessarily antagonistic to our republican institutions, and that it would be impossible for her to coexist with them. Naturally tolerant in consequence of a native want of earnestness, and having no very strong religious convictions of my own, I had been willing to allow her an "open field and fair play;" for here she was feeble, and I felt confident that the influence of American intelligence and American freedom would be amply sufficient to prevent her from ever becoming strong enough to be at all dangerous to the American state or to civil and religious liberty. To hear the priest assert that the church found here all or nearly all she wanted, or *had ever struggled for*, seemed a ridiculous paradox. Was it, indeed; true that the popes in their long and bitter struggle with the German emperor and other sovereigns had been contending only for that freedom

and independence which the state with us recognizes in every religious denomination, and protects as the birthright of every American citizen, and not for supreme power in the state, and the subjugation of the entire secular order to the domination of a haughty and arrogant priesthood?

This was too much. Could Luther and Calvin, Henry and Cranmer, and the great and learned divines of the Anglican and other communions, who for three hundred years have strenuously maintained the contrary, have been deceived or trying to deceive others? Yet here was a priest who seemed to understand himself, who appeared also to be perfectly familiar with the principles and history of his church, and who was certainly no trimmer, and no courtier of king or people, quietly, and as a matter of course, placing wholly in the wrong those great divines, and nearly the whole Protestant world, who had excused the civil intolerance of the early reformers and the princes who espoused their cause, on the ground that they only followed the teaching and example of Rome, and asserting, as if it were an admitted truth, that the church finds here in this land of religious liberty, all or nearly all that she wants, or has ever struggled to gain, and therefore must be led by her own principles and interests to use all her influence, even if gaining the ascendency, to preserve our free institutions, and especially the equal civil and religious rights of all men before the state, which our government is bound by its very constitution to recognize, protect, and defend! It disconcerted all my preconceived notions, set aside what I had supposed to be the final judgment of the world, and denied what I had supposed no one would or could question. I was puzzled. But the able editor was not puzzled or surprised at all, and I listened attentively for his reply.

VII.—"All that, Reverend Father, is easily said, and it is decidedly for your interest to say it. Your church has nearly run itself out in the Old World, and the only remaining hope of the papacy is in gaining the people of the United States; and you well know that were you to tell them the truth, and disclose to them the hopes and designs of Rome, you could not get them to listen to you a moment. Were you to tell them that there is an innate incompatibility between your church and their republic, they would soon put an end to your mission. You are shrewd enough to understand that your success depends on your persuading

them that your church, instead of opposing, approves the principles of American republicanism, and is necessary for their preservation and free and orderly working. Tell that to the marines; I believe you not; you are no disinterested witness."

"Are you a disinterested witness, my dear Editor?"

"What can you mean by asking me such a question? I have no prejudices, no interest in opposing your church."

"Let no man say he has no prejudices. You have your pride of opinion to maintain, and are not a man predisposed to yield it up to any one, or to any argument. Interest? You have no more interest, I grant, in opposing the church than the shrine-makers of Ephesus had in opposing St. Paul. You are simply a shrine-maker, and your idol is public opinion, or at least the public opinion of your party, of which you are also one of the chief priests. You are a leading journalist, and journalism is a power in the American state; but you would be nobody were you to avow yourself a member of the church, and use your journal to defend her against the misrepresentations and slanders daily inculcated against her, as strenuously as you would if they were attacks on the purity and honor of your mother. You have not as yet the grace nor the earnestness of character for that. You are too well satisfied with yourself as you are, and with the position you hold."

"And what else is to be said of the reverend father? What sacrifices has he made?"

"None that I count, though it may be some sacrifices which you and your countrymen would shrink from; for of all the people I have ever known, democrats as you are, you are the greatest idolaters of wealth, rank, and title. I have made no sacrifice, for I count all things as dung and dross, if I can but win Christ, and I have already been rewarded a hundred fold for all I ever gave up for him. I want no higher glory on earth than to be a priest of the living God, and no greater consolation than to toil and suffer for the salvation of souls. But you are in no disposition to appreciate things of this sort. There is a life that is hidden from you with God, and a joy you have no relish for."

"I certainly am no enthusiast, no fanatic, and I did not suppose you to be either one or the other. I have generally regarded the clergy of your church as cool, shrewd, calculating, ambitious men, bent on acquiring power for their church, and unscrupulous as to the means they adopt; de-

voted to their church in aiding her to dominate over kings and emperors, over the lives and fortunes, the minds and consciences of men, and to be as supreme on earth as God is in heaven; but I have held them generally as devoid of faith, of conscience, of enthusiasm, fanaticism, as of honor, and ready at all times to act on the maxim, 'The end sanctifies the means.'"

"We sometimes commit a grave mistake, my dear Mr. Editor, when we judge others by ourselves, and transfer our own views, feelings, and aims to persons who live and move in an atmosphere very different from our own, and act from motives which we have no conception of. The life of a simple, sincere, earnest child of the church is something of which you have had no experience, my friend, and that lies beyond the range of your philosophy. For my part, I do not believe what you think of us is generally true even of the ministers of the reformed religion. It is difficult for me to conceive the existence of a class of men moved by a spirit so satanic as we must be, if you are right. I cannot see in the domination you say we seek to secure for our church a sufficient motive for our conduct, for really, if we are as shrewd and as good calculators as you pretend, we must see that we do and can gain nothing. I can understand Satan. He sets himself up as the rival of God, seeks to defeat his kingdom, and to get himself worshipped as God. He has a personal end, a personal defeat to avenge, a personal victory to win, a personal malice to gratify. He hates all good, and wars against it wherever he sees it, for he has said to himself, 'Evil, be thou my good; hell, be thou my heaven.' I can understand why he should seek to destroy the kingdom of God, as I can understand why your ministers, deceived by his wiles and carried away by his delusions, should seek to destroy the church that everywhere confronts and embarrasses them; but my knowledge of human nature does not enable me to conceive how men who believe not the church to be a divine institution, who credit not her promises or her doctrines, and seek only power over men in this world, could devote their lives, traverse oceans and huge forests, in hunger and fatigue, in toil and infirmity, foregoing all the comforts of civilization, bearing contumely and contempt and persecution even unto death, to build up a powerful corporation, in whose domination they have no personal interest and can have no personal share."

"But do you not consider it a higher honor to be a sim-

ple priest of the church than to be a grandee of Spain or any other nation, than to be even king or kaiser?"

"Unquestionably, but only because I believe the church to be really the kingdom of God on earth, her doctrines to be the revealed word of God, and her sacraments to be really instituted by Christ himself, and that they really confer the grace they signify, are the channels through which the Holy Ghost is really infused into our hearts, regenerates us, elevates us to a higher life, and makes us heirs and joint-heirs with Christ of eternal glory in the heavens. Take away that belief, suppose me to act from calculation, not faith, from the mere love of earthly power, I should see no glory or greatness in the priesthood, I should find nothing in it to sustain me in my labors, or to console me in my privations, and should say with St. Paul, 'if in this life only we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable.' What could we, if we believed not, see in the domination of the church, even if we should secure it, worth living for and dying for?"

"You pretend, Reverend Father, that your church is satisfied with the order established here, and that she really favors the great principles of natural freedom and equality on which our republic is founded. If she approves these principles, and is satisfied with the relations which subsist here between church and state, why has she nowhere founded the state on the basis of equal rights?"

"The church is not the state nor the framer of its constitution, and she has not and never has pretended to have temporal authority in the temporal order. She is a spiritual kingdom—the kingdom of God on earth—and she leaves to the civil and political order that which God himself leaves to it—human free will. She has always asserted the great principles which the American people more successfully than any other have carried out in their political constitution, but it has never been her mission to apply them practically out of her own order. Our Lord did not come as a temporal Messiah. The efforts to defend these principles, even in their spiritual application, has raised an almost universal clamor against her for encroaching on the province of the civil power, and are the basis of the principal charges her enemies even now allege against her. What then would have been the outcry, had she attempted to organize political society in accordance with these principles! The relation between church and state here, which so well meets her

wants, can subsist only where the state is founded on the recognition of the freedom of conscience, and the equal rights of all, which it is bound to protect and defend. Never in the Old World has it been humanly possible to found the state on the American doctrine of equal rights embodied in the American constitution. Neither the government nor the church, even if in the province of the church, could have done it."

"Why not?"

"You, a journalist whose profession it is to instruct the people in their political rights and duties, and who ought therefore to be a master of political science and of true statesmanship, ask me such a question? Constitutions of states are not things that can be made to order, and imposed by authority, regardless of the habits, manners, customs, and traditions of the people who are to live under them. England, monarchical and aristocratic to the core, could not get on as a commonwealth, and when the dictator Cromwell died, and left no successor, she recalled the Stuarts, reëstablished the throne, and restored her old constitution. France, after the example of England, made a revolution, beheaded her king, abolished royalty, abolished nobility, adopted as her motto, 'liberty, equality, and fraternity,' imposed on herself with much ceremony, fanfaronade, beating of drums, and sounding of trumpets, an entire new constitution, made after the most approved pattern; and not only one, but many new constitutions; yet, as Thomas Carlyle says, 'they wouldn't go,' though drawn up by one who boasted that 'politics is a science he had finished.' After a period of military despotism under Napoleon I., she was forced to recall her legitimate king, to reconstruct the throne she had demolished, and reconsecrate the altars she had profaned; and she is even now governed chiefly by military force. Mexico and the South American colonies of Spain asserted their independence of the mother country, adopted constitutions framed after the great Anglo-American model, and have been in a state of anarchy ever since.

"No, sir; constitutions," continued the priest, "cannot be made and imposed on a nation. Lord John Russell's numerous experiments, under the most favorable circumstances, have proved that much. They must be born and developed with the nation; generated, not made, as Count de Maistre has amply proved. You may change a dynasty, or the magistracy of a nation, without destroying it, and

sometimes with happy results; the constitution of a nation, never. Every true statesman knows this, and seeks always to administer the affairs of the state in accordance with its fundamental constitution. He accepts that constitution as his starting-point and his inflexible law, and labors only to correct abuses that may creep in, to clear away anomalies that the vicissitudes of time or the course of events may create, and to do the best he can with it for the nation. The church cannot do otherwise, however overwhelming may be her influence. The necessary conditions of such a constitution as that of the United States, have never been found in European society, and do not exist there even yet. Its principles may have been recognized and defended by both statesmen and churchmen, but it has never been possible to organize any European state in accordance with them.

"The peculiarity of the American constitution," the priest went on, "under the point of view we are now considering it, is not merely in asserting the equality of all men before the law, but in asserting their equal rights as held not from the law, but from the Creator, anterior to civil society, and therefore rights which government is bound by its very constitution to recognize and protect to the full extent of its power. This view of rights you will not find in the Greek and Roman republics. Under them man was held to exist for the state, and had no rights but such as he held from it. You will not find it in the Roman empire, which differed from the republic only in that it aggregated the several functions of the state to the emperor. Under feudalism you had the Roman imperial system, and in addition not the rights of man, but the personal rights of the feudal chief. All your boasted progress in Europe consists in eliminating, sometimes peaceably, sometimes violently, the feudal element, and in rendering exclusive Roman imperialism on the one hand, or the pagan republic on the other, as Mazzini and Garibaldi are seeking to do in Italy, the radicals in England, and the progresistas in Spain. Is your question answered?"

"You have not, Reverend Father, proved to my satisfaction, that the church, if she gains the ascendency, will not require the state to use its power to suppress all sects opposed to her, and forbid the profession of any creed or dogma contrary to hers. It is the dread of her exclusive and persecuting spirit, which she has always manifested when she has had the power, that makes enlightened Amer-

icans set their faces against her. She has been, ever since the development of the papacy, a persecuting church, drunk with the blood of saints and martyrs, as the Waldenses and Albigenses can bear witness, as the *auto-da-fés* of your own native Spain, the massacre of the reformed in the Low Countries under the gloomy bigot, Philip II., but too well prove."

"Can you name to me any doctrine or principle of the church which makes it obligatory on her to call on the secular arm to suppress heresy or schism that uses no violence or physical force against her?"

"However that be may, her practice proves that she claims and exercises the right, and has the disposition to use it."

"Can you point me to an instance in which she has ever inflicted, or required to be inflicted, any thing more than ecclesiastical censures and discipline on peaceable schismatics and heretics, who, in defence of their heresy or their schism use no other weapons than arguments drawn from reason, history, and the Holy Scriptures? If so, will you be so good as to name it?"

"I presume that there are many instances, but I cannot name one at this moment."

"No, nor at any other moment. I am not answerable for what civil or military governments have done. They have often violated the principles and wishes of the church by their treatment of heretics. She never authorized the cruelties of Henry VIII. in England, of the duke of Alba in the Netherlands, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, or the dragonades of the Huguenots, by Louis XIV.—the last ordered by the king during the suspension of his diplomatic relations with the Holy See. The Waldenses, after they desisted from violence towards the church and her priests and members, were left in peace, and have remained unmolested to this day in the secluded valleys of Piedmont. The Albigenses were Manicheans, the descendants of the Paulicians, preaching the most licentious doctrines, and practising moral and social abominations, such as are punishable by your own laws. They were not peaceable heretics; but, protected and supported by Raymond VII., count of Toulouse, took possession of the churches and their revenues, broke up peaceable congregations of worshippers, maltreated and murdered the clergy, and even assassinated a legate of the Holy See. The pope called on the king of France, the count's suzerain, for protection, and the king

responded, and a bloody war followed against the count, assisted, part of the time at least, by James of Aragon, who was under excommunication from the pope. Suppose Brigham Young, chief of the Mormons,—whose well-known principle is, that the Lord has given to the Mormons all the possessions of the gentiles, and that if they do not take them by force, it is because they are not yet strong enough to do it—should let loose his Danites to disturb peaceable Catholic congregations met for worship, should plunder Catholic churches, murder or otherwise maltreat Catholic priests, would not the American government hold itself bound to suppress the violence, and enforce the laws against him and his followers?"

"Undoubtedly, whether the misdeeds were committed against your church or against any other church."

"Precisely: now this is all that the pope required of the secular arm against the Albigenses, in the south of France. That Simon de Montfort—who was appointed to lead the forces and execute the laws against the Albigenses, and who hoped to succeed to the possessions of Raymond—went beyond his instructions, turned the war into a war for his own personal aggrandizement, and committed cruel excesses and gross outrages on peaceable and inoffensive persons, even on helpless women and children, never intended either by the pope or the king, is very certain, for the pope withdrew the authorization he had given him, and under the direction of St. Dominic, established a court of inquiry, or inquisition, to protect the peaceable and well-disposed heretics from the excesses of the civil power."

This seemed conclusive enough, conceding the facts to be as the priest stated them. Whether they were so or not, I was not able to say; I could only say that Protestant historians give a very different account. According to them, the Albigenses were a numerous body of peaceful, evangelical Christians, who adhered to primitive Christianity, and maintained themselves in Gospel purity and free from papal corruptions and superstitions. But I do not know that Protestant historians, after all, are any better authority than Catholic historians. If the latter have an interest in whitewashing, the former have an equally strong interest in black-washing the church. The editor seemed to have nothing to reply, and changed the subject.

VIII.—"But you say nothing, Reverend Father, of the Spanish inquisition and its two hundred and thirty thousand

victims tortured and burned to death for daring to differ, on some abstruse questions, from the pope of Rome. As a native-born Spaniard, I suppose you will defend it."

"Llorente, on whose authority you rely, was a native-born Spaniard, and he did not defend it, but circulated innumerable lies against it. He was a bad Spaniard, a bad priest, and a bad Catholic, and therefore worthy of the full confidence of the reformed communion. The inquisition, as I have just told you, was originally instituted for the protection of heretics against the severity of the civil laws, which date from the pagan republic of Rome, from which the church herself had suffered for centuries, and which she had no hand in making. The Christian Roman emperors, who never allowed the church to interfere with their law-making power, sometimes suspended and sometimes renewed them, and the barbarian nations, that succeeded the Romans, though they had certain laws and customs of their own, which were the law for barbarians, continued in force for the Roman population the Roman law and jurisprudence. The Spanish inquisition, of which many horrid tales—lies for the most part—are told, was a politico-ecclesiastical court, conceded by the pope to the solicitations and representations of the kings of Spain, though reluctantly, and had for its object to ferret out and bring to trial, according to the judicial forms of the kingdom, persons accused or suspected of being engaged in secret conspiracies to overthrow in Spain both the church and the state. These persons were, for the most part, recently baptized Jews and Mussulmans, who were suspected, while publicly professing themselves Christians, and in some instances filling high offices in the church and in the state, of practising in secret their old religion, and plotting with the unbaptized Jews and Moors of Africa against the peace of the kingdom. I speak of the Spanish inquisition in its origin. It was directed against real criminals, such as the laws of every civilized state treat, and, on conviction, punish as such."

"Do you mean to say the inquisition was not established to ferret out and bring to punishment persons held to be heretics?"

"The persons against whom it was instituted doubtless were heretics, but it was not to ferret out and punish heretics, simply as such, that the pope authorized the extraordinary court called the inquisition, or that it was solicited by the kings, but against them as secret conspirators, threat-

ening the destruction of Spanish society, both civil and religious, as it was then constituted. The court, in its first period, did not take cognizance of heresy when not suspected of being coupled with other offences."

"Will you say that no heretic, as such, and such only, was ever arrested and condemned by the inquisition?"

"No, I will not say that; but I will say that it was not instituted or consented to by the supreme pontiff for that purpose."

"Were not persons suspected of favoring the reformers in Germany and the Low Countries, arrested by the agents of the inquisition and thrown into the dungeons?"

"Undoubtedly: but that makes nothing against my position. You know, I presume, that the reformers in Germany and the Low Countries, if not everywhere else, were not simply heretics in the eyes of the church, but also a political party in the eyes of the state, and, as such, carried on in the Netherlands, then belonging to Spain, a civil war against their sovereign or suzerain. They were in the eyes of the Spanish government rebels and revolutionists, and no Spaniard could favor even their theological doctrines without suspicion of high treason. At least so it was represented to the pope, who consented to the revival of the inquisition under Philip II., and its extension to the Low Countries. That the supreme pontiff did not regard the suppression of heresy unconnected with a dangerous political party seeking to revolutionize the state as well as the church, as its special purpose, is evident from the fact, that though there were many adherents of the reformers—some open and more concealed—in Naples, then an appanage to the Spanish crown, the pope absolutely refused to consent to the introduction of the inquisition into that kingdom."

"Do you maintain that no one guilty of no offence but what the church calls heresy, was ever condemned by the inquisition?"

"Not at all: I only say that this was not the purpose for which the pope consented to its establishment or reëstablishment. That it was abused, and used for purposes not originally intended, we know from the letters of the pontiff, seriously reprimanding the inquisitors for their severity and cruelty, and from his authorizing appeals from their sentences to the papal court, where in most of the cases carried up, the sentences of the inquisition were overruled, and the prisoners discharged. Besides, the two orders were so

intermingled in Spain, that it was hardly possible that an offence could be committed against either order that would not be equally an offence against the other; and it is easy to conceive, that even after the adherents of the reformers had ceased to couple their heresy with rebellion, or treasonable practices against the government—if in fact they ever did cease so to couple it in Spain—the inquisition might construe the heresy as an offence of which it had cognizance."

"But whose fault was it that the two orders became so intermingled?"

"It was the fault of the time. Many things are just and useful when adopted, that cease to be so, and, indeed, become positively hurtful, in process of time and the changes which it brings with it; yet to undo them, or to reform the abuses to which they have ultimately led, and which have become incorporated into the habits, the customs, the life of a people, and especially if they favor the secular government by giving it a *quasi* authority in ecclesiastical affairs, is a work of great difficulty and delicacy. *Hoc opus, hic labor est.* The popes had conceded many privileges to the Christian princes of Spain after the Mussulman invasion and conquest of nearly the whole kingdom, and the Christians were but a feeble remnant taking refuge in the mountains of the Asturias, and during the war against the infidels for the recovery of the kingdom, which lasted nearly eight hundred years. These privileges strengthened the hands of the princes and of the Christian warriors, and served the interests of both religion and national independence. But when the war was ended, Granada had fallen, the last Mussulman prince expelled from the Iberian peninsula, and Spain was once more free and Christian, the order of things that had grown up during the long struggle for the Christian faith and national integrity ceased to be necessary or useful, and became in many respects positively injurious to both church and state, and especially embarrassing to the church. The king was found to have an undue authority in ecclesiastical matters; there was produced a sort of confusion of the two orders, for which Spain and Spanish America are now paying the penalty. I defend not that confusion of church and state, which resulted from measures wise and just in their origin, nor do I defend throughout the Spanish inquisition, always more political than ecclesiastical; but I cannot join in the ordinary outcry against either. I prefer, wherever practicable, the relations of church and state which subsist in your republic."

"But did I not understand you to defend the union of church and state in the Old World?"

"The *union*, yes; but not the *fusion* of church and state, or the intermingling of the two authorities. The trouble in Spain was not, as you suppose, that the church had too much power or independence, but that the government had gradually come to exercise an undue power in ecclesiastical appointments and ecclesiastical administration. The two authorities should always be kept distinct; and while the church abstains from all interference in the administration of the purely temporal affairs of the state, the secular government should have no authority in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The only union of church and state, as polities or corporations, I have defended, is that implied by concordats which accord to the state certain specified rights and powers, and impose on it certain obligations with regard to ecclesiastical matters."

"If you express the views of your church, I see not why she condemns those who advocate a separation of church and state."

"I have already shown you why. In the Old World the state has never recognized the American doctrine. The state has remained always pagan, as you are laboring to make it here, and I fear successfully. It claimed the absolute supremacy in all things, and that the rights of the church were held from it, or by its concession. It would concede her freedom only as the state religion, and as a state religion the state had, according to its theory of its own supremacy, the right to control its administration. This the church could not, as a spiritual kingdom, permit; but as the state would concede her no rights save as the established religion of the state, she was obliged to acquiesce in her establishment by law, and to secure by law or treaty the best terms for herself that she could. To dissolve the treaty or abrogate the law, and thus separate her entirely from the state, would leave her without any rights at all which the secular power holds itself bound to recognize."

"But what need, even supposing this to be so, had she to insist that the state should exclude, under the severest pains and penalties, all religions but herself? Simple protection from their violence would have answered her purpose as you pretend it does now."

"I am not aware that she ever did so insist. She had to accept her establishment as the state religion to be able to

exercise any of her spiritual rights under the protection of law, and the state was too logical, when it had declared her the state religion, not to forbid all religions opposed to her. The laws against heretics grew naturally out of the supremacy claimed by the state, as under both the pagan republic and the pagan empire; and as that claim had never been acknowledged by the church, she is in no sense responsible for the civil exclusion of heretics. You have only to study the controversies between the legists and the canonists during the struggle of the pope and the emperor in the middle ages, or between the canonists and the French parliaments in more recent times, to be satisfied that much of what you and men like you have attributed to the church, is simply due to the arrogant and false claims of the secular order, always denied and resisted by the church. The whole difficulty grew out of the assumption by the pagan state of supremacy, or its refusal to acknowledge an order of rights which you call the rights of man, and I the rights of the Creator, anterior and superior to itself, not derived from it, and which it is, as I so often repeat, bound to recognize and protect for all men. The church was the guardian and defender of this order of rights against the tyranny of princes and civil magistrates."

"You would then claim for your church the championship of liberty against tyranny, and boldly deny her despotic, tyrannical, and persecuting spirit?"

"Of course I do, and so would you, if you had studied her history, understood and approved the order of rights recognized and established by your own republic. The church has always been on the side of true liberty, of justice, charity, humanity. He who defends against the arrogant pretensions of the secular order the rights of God, if I may so speak, defends the rights of man. You see, or would see, if your eyes were open, that the popes, in defending the rights of the spiritual order against secular tyrants, were the real defenders of freedom, and the powerful opponents of the pagan republic or empire where liberty was restricted to the liberty of the state or city to govern; where the individual was nothing and the state every thing. You would see it also, by what followed in those nations that, in the sixteenth century, threw off the papacy and rejected the authority of the church. In them all, the secular authority was alike supreme in politics and in religion; and if there was liberty for the individual to blas-

pheme the church and curse the pope, there was no liberty for him to dissent from the religion of the state or the prince. Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, in England, were beheaded, because they would not subscribe to the declaration that the king was supreme in spirituals as well as temporals, and seventy-two priests were condemned to death and executed, and hundreds of laymen were doomed to death, and I know not how many more had their goods confiscated and were suffered to die in loathsome dungeons, or were banished the realm, under Queen Elizabeth, because they would not take the oath of the royal supremacy. The king and parliament enacted the creed and liturgy of the new-made church of England, as they still do, and as did the princes or secular authority in every state that apostatized from the church. It has cost these nations centuries of revolution and civil war to regain some portion of the liberty the church had always defended for them. You, my friend, are a thorough pagan in your views of the relation of church and state, and in your opposing the church you are warring against the very idea of that freedom which the church defends, and which makes the glory of your republic."

"The American republic is only the American people, and American liberty is simply liberty as they understand it; and the American people do not understand either civil or religious liberty in your sense, and they spurn the glory you would award them."

"I call the American republic the American people as organized by the constitution and laws, and I place their glory in having recognized liberty as as a spiritual right, not as a civil grant, and therefore of having identified it in principle with conscience, which is accountable to God alone; or in other words, in having founded their state on the principle of justice and equal rights, and therefore on the supremacy of the spiritual order, which the church has always asserted and defended. That you do not see that making justice and equal rights not civil grants, but the very basis of the state, is the assertion of the supremacy of the spiritual order, is very possible; that the American people are losing sight of it, and are resolving the sovereignty of the people into the sovereignty of popular opinion, is no doubt true, and to be deeply regretted. You are, as a people, no longer what you were even when I first became an American citizen, and you are changing every

day, and, in an old man's judgment, for the worse. You are losing the sense of the great principles on which your fathers built, and no longer see or understand the deep significance of the providential constitution of your republic. You are perverting the Christian to the pagan republic. Hence your great need of the church to recall your minds to the first principles of your institutions, and to enable you to inherit the glory of being the first nation that ever fully asserted spiritual freedom."

Here the conversation closed for the day. The editor was silent for the first time, and seemed thoughtful. For myself, I was confounded, and hardly dared trust my own ears. I had no more doubted that the Romish church had been an arrogant and domineering, a cruel and persecuting church, than I had doubted my own existence. Had I not in my infancy learned the *New-England Primer* — my father was a Puritan—and the story of John Rogers, and as I grew up had I not read *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and Fox's *Book of Martyrs?* Was I to be told all that I had been taught, and all I had read in history, against the church of Rome was false and calumnious, and that the pope, instead of being Antichrist, had from the first been, in being the champion of the claims of the church, the champion of freedom and humanity? This was too much. I could swallow much, but not this. Had all the great, learned, and pious men, who ought to have known what they said, and who had borne their testimony against her, been deceived, or willing to deceive others? No; it could not be.

And yet many more men, a hundred to one of them, equally great, equally learned, equally pious, equally distinguished, equally incapable of deceiving or of being deceived, had as directly and as explicitly borne their testimony in her favor. Here was this venerable priest, whose very face, and the tones of whose voice, won your confidence, and who seemed to know beforehand all the objections of the journalist, and was always prompt with his answer; could I doubt his knowledge or his sincerity? He seemed never to be taken by surprise, he seemed to shirk no difficulty, and to meet every question fairly and frankly. Had we all been mistaken? I wish the editor was better able to cope with the priest. Well, I am too old to trouble my head with so perplexing a question; I will dismiss it.

IX.—I DID not succeed in dismissing the subject from my mind, though I would not let it trouble me much. I had learned long ago to take life easy, and never to let any thing seriously disturb it. I had not thought much of religion, and was not, though a New-Englander by birth and breeding, of an earnest character. I usually, after my father's death, attended the services of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for it was only decent to observe some form of worship, and the Episcopalian Church had a decorous service, and was a church that an easy-going gentleman could attend. It did not pry into one's private character or private affairs, exacted not much of one's time or thought, and the minister, usually a well-bred man, of agreeable manners, and a good reader, edified his congregation with a gracefully written and delivered sermon, or moral essay, which tasked no one's credulity, and disturbed no one's conscience. So it was in my younger days; it is somewhat different now, I am told; but my pastor is of the old school, and distracts his people with none of the novelties which, since the beginning of the tractarian movement, have disturbed the peace of the church.

Yet the words of the priest had taken an unusual hold of me, and haunted me in spite of myself. They had not convinced me, but they had shaken me, and made me suspect that there might be another side to the story; so the next day, seeing the priest and the journalist apparently about to resume the conversation of yesterday, I drew near to listen, with more eagerness than I was in the habit of showing or even feeling. The journalist, as I came near, was saying:

"All that, Reverend Father, will do to tell to ignorant papists, who have been trained from infancy to swallow every thing their priests say, but we all know that your church claims to teach by authority, and that she allows no religious liberty. She tolerates no free thought, no exercise of reason—that noblest prerogative of man—permits no one to think for himself, or to have and act on convictions of his own."

"Do not the adherents of the reformers profess to teach by authority? Do they not assert the infallible authority of the Bible, and forbid any one to hold any thing contrary thereto? How much more free thought or free thinking for one's self is there under an infallible book than under an infallible church?"

"I am not bound by the reformers. I honor them for

the noble stand they took against the arrogance and despotism of Rome, and for having originated a movement which, in its onward progress, sweeps away the spiritual despotism of the papal church, delivers the world from spiritual thraldom, secures religious liberty, regains the free exercise of reason, and vindicates the rights and dignity of human nature. Man can now be man, free and noble, not the trembling, crouching victim of priestcraft and superstition."

"Do you know all that, my dear journalist?"

"Certainly I do."

"You know a great deal, then, as becomes the chief editor of a leading metropolitan journal, which gives its opinions off-hand on every subject and some others. But are you, after all, quite sure that the church proscribes reason, anathematizes free thought, and permits no one to think or act for himself?"

"Quite sure."

"Then you are sure of much more than I am. I have never found myself forbidden to reason, and have never felt my freedom of thought restrained."

"You know well, Reverend Father, that the church imposes on you a creed, all cut and dried, which you must believe, without ever being permitted any free examination of it, or to entertain any doubt of its truth. You have never been free to adopt any conclusion contrary to her authoritative teaching."

"Without falling into error, and exposing myself to the inevitable consequences of error, agreed; but have you?"

"Have I? I am free to examine all questions for myself, and to abide by the convictions of my own mind, whether they square with the teachings of the church or not."

"Without danger of error, or of missing the truth?"

"My convictions—my honest convictions—are the truth for *me*."

"Truth, then, has no existence independent of one's own honest convictions. How, then, do you distinguish truth from falsehood? Nay, what distinction can there be? Men's convictions differ, and what is the truth for one may be falsehood for another. The same thing, then, may be both true and false, be and not be, at one and the same time. I admit I have never been free to believe that."

"In this world we can never know what truth is independent of us, nor that there is any truth but our own convic-

tions. Freedom of thought, the free exercise of reason, the right to think for ourselves, means the recognition of the sufficiency of each one's own convictions for himself,"

"That is, a man who always acts according to his own convictions of what is true or false, right or wrong, is morally irreproachable?"

"That is what I mean."

"So, if you had a real conviction that you ought to cut my throat, you would commit no wrong in doing so. Is that the conclusion at which you arrive by what you call the free exercise of reason?"

"My reason tells me that such an act would be wrong."

"Undoubtedly, because it tells you that there is a right, therefore a truth, not dependent on your convictions, to which your convictions themselves must conform in order to be true, or a safe rule of conduct."

"But every man has the natural right to the free exercise of his own mind in seeking the truth, and no one can believe contrary to his convictions."

"Nothing more true. But a man's convictions to-day may change to-morrow, and the truth which now contradicts them, may be in accordance with them, when he has changed them. I cannot believe contrary to my convictions, for my convictions are my belief, for the time being; and it is very true that no one can believe what contradicts his reason. But things may appear to contradict reason, and therefore incredible, that in reality accord with reason. When the apparent contradiction is explained they become credible, and on sufficient testimony, or adequate authority, may be believed without any surrender of reason; nay, reason then requires them to be believed. Because in such cases I believe on the authority of the church, am I deprived of the free exercise of my reason?"

"The church tells you beforehand what you must and must not believe, and permits you no free inquiry after truth, and thus dwarfs or stunts the growth of the mind."

"That is to say, the mind grows and expands not by the possession of truth, but by the search after it! That is part and parcel of the doctrine of progress, which we disposed of some days ago. The body, according to you, it seems, is dwarfed or stunted in its growth, is rendered weak and sickly by having appropriate food, and grows, becomes strong and healthy by not having it, and by seeking and never finding it! Truth is the appropriate food of the

mind, which pines away and dies of inanition without it. They who have the truth do not need to seek it—for one seeks only what one has not—and they who have it not are not only free, but bound to seek it with all diligence and perseverance. To you, and such as you, the church not only permits but commands free inquiry. Your objection to the church, then, is not well put."

"The church begins with the child and prejudices it in the very outset against all views of truth but her own, so that never after can it inquire freely. The objection to her is, that she closes the mind, and does not leave it open to the reception of new views, new discoveries, nor encourage it to advance with ever-advancing science."

"Something of that has already been considered. There is, my friend, a difference between us, which is not unnatural. You, finding that you have not the truth, and despairing of ever finding it, hold that the good thing is not the possession of truth, but the exertion the mind makes in seeking it; I, believing that the church has taught me the truth from my infancy, hold that the good thing is in possessing it, and using it to make me and my fellow-men wiser and better. You assume that the church teaches the child her *view* of truth—that is, a theory of truth; I hold that she teaches no view or theory of truth, but the truth itself. Supposing me to be right in this, your objection turns only against yourself. If the church teaches the child the truth, she does not prejudice the child against truth, but simply arms it against error—a very wholesome prejudice, if prejudice it be. You, confessing that you have not yet attained to the knowledge of the truth, and therefore can have at best only a view or theory of truth, which, upon examination, may or may not turn out to be true, feel very naturally that any attempt to give the child instruction is to prejudice it against every view but the one presented, and thus to forestall its judgment. You are right on your hypothesis; but how on that hypothesis can you consistently give your child any instruction at all? It strikes me that you should leave the child's mind to grow up in as complete ignorance of religion and morality, as perfect a blank, as possible. This would exclude all parental instruction, all domestic education and discipline, all schools, colleges, and even universities, and forbid all efforts to 'train the young idea how to shoot.' It is your doctrine, not that of the church, my dear journalist, that is hostile to thought, to-

education, to science and learning, and that fosters ignorance."

"I do not concede that what the church teaches is true, and reject her dogmas as false and absurd, and her morality as repugnant to human nature."

"Without having ever examined either, or ascertained what they are?"

"I know them well."

"As misrepresented and perverted by the enemies of the church."

"I reject her dogmas."

"On what authority?"

"On the authority of reason: no better authority is needed for a rational man."

"Do you say the dogmas of the church contradict reason?"

"Certainly: her dogmas are unreasonable and absurd."

"Does that mean, in your vocabulary, any thing more than that they do not lie in the plane of reason, and that by reason alone you are unable to see or demonstrate their truth?"

"It means that they are contrary to reason, and are intrinsically incredible."

"That is a serious assertion, and I presume you are ready to prove it."

"That is easy enough; but it would necessitate a sort of discussion for which I have no taste."

"I do not doubt it; besides, you shift your ground. You began by objecting to the church—not as a theologian, but as a publicist—that she holds principles and authorizes practices dangerous to liberty, hostile to progress, and at war with modern civilization. This was a legitimate ground of objection for a secularist. You raised a question which we could discuss on a ground, and decide by principles, common to us both."

"But I do the same when I object to the church that she teaches doctrines contrary to reason, for we both admit the authority of reason."

"For all questions lying within the plane of reason; but for questions above that plane, reason has only a negative authority. The dogmas of the church are, if any thing, above reason; and if they do not contradict reason, it can judge neither of their truth nor their falsity."

"So you refuse to submit the dogmas of the church to the tribunal of reason. That is precisely what I complain of."

"Their intrinsic truth or falsity, yes; because, if truths at all, they are truths not of reason, but of revelation. Yet the question, whether they contradict reason or not, and the further question, whether I have adequate authority for believing them to be divinely revealed or not, are both questions to be decided, when raised, at the tribunal of reason."

"But suppose I prove the dogmas contrary to Scripture, would not that be enough for my purpose?"

"No dogmas repugnant to the Holy Scriptures can be true; but the question whether the dogmas of the church are or are not repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, is one I cannot discuss with you."

"Why not?"

"Because the Holy Scriptures were deposited with the church, not with you, and you are not their authorized interpreter. Also, because I have a strong suspicion that you have as little respect for their authority as you have for the authority of the church. You may or may not believe them as you understand them, but they probably weigh little with you in any other sense. My understanding of them may be very different from yours, and there is no authority we both accept, to decide between us which of us is right or which is wrong. Each of us might insist on his own understanding, and be unable to convince the other, and so we might dispute for ever without settling any thing."

"This, Reverend Father, is precisely my objection to your church. She refuses to submit her dogmas to the test either of reason or the Scriptures. It is therefore I accuse her of opposing religious liberty, anathematizing reason, and denying the freedom of thought."

"The church refuses to submit no question to the test of reason which is within the province of reason, and she would be false to reason if she submitted any other. Any doctrine that contradicts either Scripture or reason, she holds to be incredible and false. All I insist on is, that the doctrine must really, not apparently only, contradict one or the other, and that the church is as high authority, to say the least, as my friend the journalist, for determining what does or does not contradict reason, what is or is not repugnant to the Holy Scriptures."

"My objection is that she violates the freedom of the mind and true religious liberty, by imposing a creed which is not in the province of reason, and commands her mem-

bers, on pain of eternal damnation, to believe dogmas, of the truth or falsity of which she herself teaches that reason is not competent to judge."

"Your objection, if valid against the church, is equally valid against divine revelation itself; at least against the revelation of any thing above the natural order. But I see not how what you allege, even if true, violates religious liberty. The dogmas and discipline of the church are matters within the spiritual order, with which you, as a publicist, have nothing to do. You are not one of her members, and the law does not compel you to become a member, to hold her doctrines, or to submit to her discipline. No one is compelled to join her communion against his will; and would it accord with your notions of religious liberty to prevent by force those who would do so from joining her, or to use force to compel her to change either her doctrine or her discipline?"

X.—"It is a shame and a disgrace, that in this enlightened age, and in this free republic, a church that teaches such antiquated and absurd dogmas, and exercises such despotic control over her members, should be suffered to exist."

"So you would suppress her by force, and outlaw all who adhere to her! You do not seem to have made much progress since the reformers in your understanding of religious liberty. Do you call it religious liberty to deny me the right to belong to and defend the church, while you are free to reject her and use force against her? This, I am aware, was the view of the reformers in the sixteenth century, but I thought you had advanced beyond them. Are you not a little antiquated in your notions? or have you forgot your part, and supposed you were opposing, not defending, the freedom of religion?"

"There is no violation of religious liberty in warring against the church. She is intrinsically a spiritual despotism. Such is the control she has over her ignorant and superstitious members, that few of them dare leave her communion."

"Well, what do you propose to do about it? Does not religious liberty mean the freedom of conscience? If my conscience requires me to believe what the church teaches, and to submit to her discipline, what freedom of conscience have I if the state forbids me to do so, and punishes me with fine, imprisonment, exile, or death, if I follow my own

conscience without disturbing others in the peaceful enjoyment of theirs? Do you boast of the equality of all men, and yet contend that I and my brethren have not an equal right with you and yours to the freedom of conscience? Whence do you derive any right of conscience which we have not?"

"The church denies to men their natural freedom, and, by so doing, forfeits all right for herself, and justifies the use of force against her."

"So said the late Know-Nothing party, and therefore proposed to deprive Catholics of the right of citizenship. Had they succeeded, they probably would have gone so far as to prohibit any citizen, under pain of treason to the state, to give a Catholic either 'fire or water.' This would have been not much more than was done by some of the old colonial laws, which made it a highly penal offence to harbor a priest for a single night, or to give him even a single meal of victuals. Your countrymen, however, did not take kindly to the Know-Nothing party, except in a few localities, and have already nearly if not quite forgotten it. The doctrines and practices of the church cannot be more offensive to you than the doctrines and practices of those outside of her communion are to her or to me; and if she bears with you, why cannot you bear with her? If you dislike her doctrine and worship, if you believe them despotic and degrading, are you not free to say so, and prove you are right if you can? What hinders you from using all your learning, wit, and science against her? Do you fear that in an open field and fair encounter she will get the better of you, and therefore require her to be bound hand and foot by the civil magistrate before you dare venture to enter the lists against her? If so, your confidence in your cause is far less than my confidence in mine."

"This would do very well if your church held herself amenable to reason, but that she does not. A church that will not reason can not be met by reason. She can be met only by force. She is exclusive, claims supremacy, will be all or nothing; and nothing, I say, let her be."

"So, while you recognise the equal rights as citizens under the protection of the laws of sectarians, Jews, Mahometans, pagans, and scoffers at all religion, you make an exception against the church, and against her alone. Well, if you did but know it, the distinction you make is in the highest degree honorable to her, and proves that she must

have a merit none of them can pretend to. But let us examine your reasons for excepting the church from the equal rights on which your republic is based."

"Do you deny that she refuses to hold herself amenable to reason?"

"Certainly I do, and energetically. She holds the truth or falsity of her doctrines is above the plane of reason, but she concedes that her children should have the highest and best of all reasons for believing them. Things which contradict reason are incredible and false, as I have already told you; but things may be above reason, the intrinsic truth or falsity of which lies beyond the direct apprehension of reason, and yet not be contrary to reason. These things, accredited by adequate testimony, are credible, and reason herself requires us to believe them. The dogmas of the church are received and believed, because God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, has revealed them. I cannot raise the question whether what he reveals is true or not. What he reveals is his word, and his word is true. There is and can be no better or higher reason for believing any thing than the fact that God says it."

"Than the *fact* that he says it; but that fact must be proved. You have no proof of it; you simply take it on the authority of the church, and have only her word for it."

"If God has instituted the church, made her the witness and keeper of his revelation, and commissioned her to go into all the earth and teach it to every creature, to all men and nations; and if he remains ever present with her, assisting her to teach it, and supernaturally guarding her against the possibility of error in teaching it, her word is amply sufficient to accredit the fact of revelation, all the demands of reason are complied with, and my faith is in the highest sense reasonable. The divine commission to teach warrants the infallibility of the commissioned in teaching, for God can not authorize the teaching of error."

"The fact of the divine commission to teach the word of God, must itself be proved, not assumed."

"Agreed. The church has always claimed it, and there is not and never has been a rival claimant. Her claim was made in the time of the apostles, and down to the sixteenth century was admitted by the whole Christian world, and is still admitted by the immense majority of all who bear the Christian name; by all, indeed, except those whom she condemns as heretics, and even they admitted it before she

condemned them. She has the right then to plead possession, prescription, and it is for those who deny that she is rightfully in possession, to show good and valid reasons why she should be ousted, or her claim be set aside."

"Do you mean to assert that the eastern churches have always admitted and still admit the infallible authority of the church in teaching?"

"Certainly I do. They hold as firmly as I do the divine and infallible authority of the church to teach all men and nations the revelation of God. There is no dispute between them and the western church as to the authority of the church. The oriental churches not in communion with the Roman see, simply deny that the supreme authority is vested in the bishop of Rome, and assert that it is vested in the general council of bishops. Yet they hold that it is essential to a general council and the validity of its acts that it be convoked and presided over by the Roman pontiff, in person or by his legates, and that its acts be approved by him. The only nominal Christians worth counting, who deny the infallibility of the church in matters of faith and morals, are the adherents of the reformers in the sixteenth century, commonly called Protestants. They have all the rest of Christendom against them."

"Prescription may be a good title in law, or in matters where absolute right is impracticable, and can be only approximated; but in matters of faith, where absolute truth is assumed to be necessary, if presumptive proof, it certainly is not conclusive."

"It is only as presumptive proof that I urge it. Yet in the present case it is really conclusive. There is no moment of time since the apostles, that the claim has not been made, conceded, and acted on. It must then have an apostolic origin; and if of apostolic origin, the question is settled, since the church is founded on the apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

"The claim of the church was vicious in its origin, and prescription avails nothing. No such commission ever issued."

"The presumption is against you, and the *onus probandi* is on you; prove what you allege, and you will unquestionably unchurch the church. But how will you prove it? Do you set up a counter-claim for yourself or the reformation?"

"No. Have I not just said that no commission was issued?"

"Then, of course, neither you nor the sects that sprung from the reformation, have any infallible authority or divine commission to teach."

"We claim none. We have not the arrogance and presumption of Rome."

"Then neither you nor they are any authority against the church. You at best are confessedly fallible, and she at worst can be only fallible. Her chances, at the very lowest, of being right, are equal to yours at the very highest. You must, then, support your denial by proof, or it will count for nothing."

The church cannot be infallible, if she contradicts herself; teaches one thing to-day and another and a contradictory doctrine to-morrow."

"Certainly not. But she has never done so, and you are hardly free, till you retract the charge you began by preferring, to maintain that she has."

"Whether she has or has not contradicted herself, is a purely historical question; and history presents us the scandal of councils contradicting councils, popes contradicting councils, and councils contradicting popes."

"So says Chillingworth; but so says not history in any sense to your purpose. The infallibility of the church is not universal, but extends only to the things covered by the commission, in the words of our Lord, 'All things whatsoever I have commanded you.' It is not claimed that it is commensurate with her authority, or that she is infallible except in teaching the revealed truth, and in judging what does or does not accord with it. Disciplinary canons are obligatory, but not necessarily infallible; and the infallibility of the church is restricted to her doctrinal canons, or her dogmatic definitions; definitions either declaring what the faith is, or what it is not, that is, condemning what is opposed to it."

"Very well. I understand all that."

"The church speaks infallibly only when she speaks in her unity and integrity, that is, through an œcumenical council, or through her supreme pontiff, vicar of Christ, and successor of Peter in apostolic authority. Theologians add a third way, the *ecclesia dispersa*, or the bishops dispersed, and each in communion with the pope, teaching in his own particular diocese; but as we can know only through the pope or an œcumenical council, what these bishops dispersed throughout the whole world agree in teaching and believing,

I need not count it. Now, in order to sustain your assertion, you must produce an instance of an œcumenical council contradicting the dogmatic teaching of another œcumenical council or a pope, and of a pope contradicting the dogmatic teaching of an œcumenical council or another pope or supreme pontiff. Can you produce an instance?"

"I can find instances enough. The Council of Nicæa differed from the Council of Antioch. Pope Liberius, after his return from exile, condemned the acts and the fathers of the Council of Rimini; the Council of Chalcedon and the pope both contradicted the second Council of Ephesus, in regard to the monophysite doctrine of Eutyches; a council and a pope both censure Pope Honorius as a fautor of the monothelite heresy; and there were several councils that condemned the keeping and worshipping of images, and others that approved it. Many more instances, I doubt not, might be adduced, but these are enough to prove what I have said."

"Yet, unhappily for your argument, not one of them is historically true, or if true, to your purpose. There was no œcumenical Council of Antioch, and therefore its acts were not contradicted by the Council of Nicæa. The Council of Rimini was no œcumenical council, and the acts of the bishops assembled, who were grossly maltreated by the Arian emperor, had no validity, for St. Liberius refused to approve, and in fact, as you allege, condemned them. There was no *second* Council of Ephesus, and so there could be no contradiction between it and Chalcedon. There was an irregular and tumultuous assembly, commonly called the *latrocinium* of Ephesus, but its acts were instantly condemned by the pope, St. Leo the Great, and were never accounted of any authority either in the East or in the West. No council or pope ever condemned any dogmatic decision of Pope Honorius, and he was censured after his death, not for his faith, which was orthodox, but for having favored the monothelite heresy by his culpable negligence in not suppressing it. No council, general or particular, ever approved what you call the *worship* of images, and no general council ever condemned the keeping and honoring sacred images and pictures for the worth to which they are related. The assemblies convoked by the iconoclastic emperors of Byzantium, that condemned them, had no authority to speak in the name of the church. There is no instance on record, or producible, of any dogmatic contradiction between one pope

and another, or between a pope and a general or œcumenical council."

"It is easy to get rid of contradictions in your way; you have only to declare one of the contradictors an irregular assembly, or no council, and the work is done."

"The sneer is misplaced. The general council is a regular body, and must be convoked by the pope, or with his consent; it must be presided over by the Roman pontiff in person or by his legate, and its acts must be approved by the pope, as must the acts of your congress by your president. So it is ordained by the ancient canons, admitted by the East and the West, and hence the schismatic Greeks confess to this day their inability to hold an œcumenical council, because such a council can be held only under the presidency of the archbishop of Rome."

"Let the Greeks go; they are no better than the Romanists. But because no instance of dogmatic contradiction has been produced, we cannot say none exists."

"But you must produce it before you can argue from it against the infallibility of the church. If there were any such, we should have had it produced by the enemies of the church before this. Your learned divines have ransacked every nook and corner of history to find a well-authenticated instance of the kind, and have failed, and now very generally, like yourself, bring the contrary charge, that she is unprogressive, and teaches always the same dogmas, and claims always the same authority."

It struck me that the priest here made a strong point, and if borne out by the facts of the case, the charge of the editor, that the church does not hold herself amenable to reason, and is therefore a spiritual despotism which may be suppressed in the name of religious liberty, is not sustained. Certainly the reformers did claim the right to use force against her, and as far as I recollect my reading, there was no instance in which the reformation gained an establishment, except by the aid of the civil authority; and wherever it gained over the civil authority, it prohibited the church, forbade Catholic worship, and punished adherence to it with fines, imprisonment, exile, and death. The state confiscated the revenues of the old religion, demolished or took possession of its churches, abbeys and priories, schools, colleges, universities, libraries, hospitals, foundations for the poor and the infirm, and carried on a wholesale system of robbery and plunder, and in some countries of wholesale massacre; as for instance, in Sweden, under Gustavus Vasa.

These things always pained me, but I had supposed them excusable, if not justifiable, by the fact that the old church was a spiritual despotism, the common enemy of God and man. So on the same ground I had defended the European liberals in their violence to the church, who, wherever they attain to power, use it to abolish her, as in the French revolution, or to restrict her, as in Italy, Austria, and Spain. But if what the priest says be true, the church is no spiritual despotism, and offers no violence to reason, but gives the highest and best of all reasons for the authority she claims, and the truth of what she teaches.

Surely things may be above reason, or supra-rational without being against reason or contra-rational. Human reason is not unlimited, and who dares say that nothing exists of which reason cannot take cognizance, or that the limits of reason are the limits of reality? This is a question which affects Protestants no less than it does Catholics, and no one felt it more strongly than Luther, who even represents, as I am told, reason as worthless. Whoever professes to believe in the Christian mysteries, whether he believes them on the authority of the church or of the Bible, professes to believe in the supra-rational, or truths above reason. The mysteries of the Trinity, the incarnation, the vicarious atonement and sacrifice, redemption, election, regeneration, the relation of the regenerated soul to Christ, or the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life, are all above reason; and if nothing above reason can be believed without denying and rejecting reason, nothing distinctively Christian can be believed.

Whether God has revealed these mysteries or not, is a question of fact; and if the fact be duly accredited, to believe it is as reasonable as to believe any fact on competent and sufficient testimony. There are thousands of things which we all believe on testimony, that is, simply on authority; and do I reject reason when, on the authority of history, I believe there was such a man as Julius Cæsar, or that he was assassinated in the senate chamber? Is belief on adequate authority never a reasonable belief? Nobody can pretend it. Then suppose the mysteries are simply above reason, not against reason, they are not incredible *a priori*, and on adequate authority or testimony, may be as readily and as reasonably believed as any other facts that rest on testimony. No testimony, less than the direct testimony, or word of God, could suffice to prove directly their truth; but all that

is needed to be proved is the fact that God has revealed them; their truth follows from the fact that God, who reveals them, cannot lie, and is truth itself; and to prove the fact that God has revealed them, ordinary historical testimony suffices.

Clearly, then, the editor was hasty in declaring that the church refuses to reason. If the facts are as the priest stated, his conclusion is logical, and cannot be gainsaid. There can be no doubt that the divine commission to teach carries with it the divine pledge of the infallibility of the commission in all things covered by the commission. If the commission was issued to the church—to the papal church—her infallibility follows as a simple logical sequence, as does the truth of all she teaches as divine revelation. Suppose the facts, the conclusion is irresistible. But was the commission ever issued? was it issued to the apostles and their successors, and is the papal church their legitimate successor? These are the points to be proved, and if proved, the controversy is ended with all who can and dare reason. Is it Protestants, then, who reject reason?

XI.—The journalist saw nothing in the priest's answer to accept or deny. He could and would on no consideration whatever accept the infallibility of the church. He did not profess to be a philosopher or a theologian, and seemed to regard a publicist as perfectly competent to sit in judgment on either. I who, perhaps, had first and last picked up here and there far more knowledge of ecclesiastical history than he could boast, felt myself, while reluctant to admit the priest's reading of history, quite too ignorant to pronounce him wrong. But the editor proceeded as if all statements that went beyond his knowledge, or against his theories, could be only a fable or a cunning invention. What struck me most in him was his apparent inability to recognize common sense or common honesty in the adherents of the old religion. He seemed to suppose them all knaves or fools, devoured on the one hand by a crafty and intriguing spirit, and on the other degraded by the grossest ignorance, superstition, and slavishness. He believed this was the only effect to be looked for from the church, and therefore he would keep no terms with her. Indifferent to all else, he was deadly hostile to the pope and Catholicity. He replied:

"Be all that, Reverend Father, as it may, I still insist

that your church is hostile to freedom of thought, to the use of reason, and to religious liberty. She professes to be the kingdom of God on earth, to have the right to govern all men and nations, and to be invested with absolute authority over reason and conscience. In joining her communion, you surrender both to her dictation, and are no longer free to say your soul is your own. You part with your very manhood, and become an abject slave."

"It is singular that I have never, during my long life, discovered that alleged fact. I have always felt and acted as a freeman, as I have already told you."

"That is because her chains have eaten into your very soul, and you are a slave without knowing it. You know you are not free to believe as your own reason dictates, and must defend the opinions your church bids you defend."

"I am a slave, as St. Paul said he was a slave, to Jesus Christ, and glory in it, for slavery to him is true freedom—a freedom which none separated from him or his church ever enjoy or have any conception of. You, my dear journalist, have yet to learn that all real freedom is in subjection to God. They who do not submit themselves, body and soul, to him to whom they belong, have no true liberty, but are veritable slaves of doubt and uncertainty, of ignorance and error, or of their own passions and lusts. It is the truth, not error, that makes free."

"The church denies you the liberty of forming your own opinions; you are obliged to accept hers on pain of eternal exclusion from heaven."

"You labor under a slight mistake, my philosophical friend. The church teaches and enjoins no opinions. According to her doctrine, as I have learned it, opinions are free, and she in no degree restricts them in any thing which is a matter of opinion, or on which the truth is not revealed or known."

"But you are not free to form your own opinions."

"Why not? What restrains me? Perhaps there is a little misunderstanding between us. You demand freedom to form your own opinions: may I ask on what subjects?"

"On all subjects."

"Are you free to form opinions on subjects on which you know the truth, and are certain? Take the axioms of mathematics, and the definitions of geometry; are you free to form your own opinions concerning them? Is it a matter of opinion that the sun, whose golden rays we see gild-

ing yonder mountain-top, is approaching the western horizon? Is it a matter of opinion that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles?"

"No; these are matters of science or of sight. I know them and assert them as facts of knowledge, not as opinions."

"Then where you know the truth and are certain, you are not free to form your own opinions, for there is no room for any opinion at all. Then you are and demand to be free to form your own opinion only where you are ignorant and uncertain of the truth?"

"That is all."

"Well, my dear free-thinking friend, I have all the freedom that you have or ask for. Where the church does not teach me the truth, put me in possession of the knowledge of the truth, she leaves me free to form and follow my own opinions. I am then at least as free as you are; besides I may, possibly, have much knowledge of truth which you have not."

"But, if you form, utter, or act on opinions contrary to what she teaches, she condemns and punishes you as a heretic."

"Not if I do it ignorantly and in good faith, not knowing what on the points on which I err she really teaches; but if I do know what she teaches, and thus know the truth, there is, as we have seen, no matter of opinion in the case. We can form opinions only where we do not know the truth, and are doubtful where it lies. The church does not impose opinions, she teaches the truth. Your misapprehension grows out of your assumption that all theological doctrines are simply opinions. They really are so with you, who substitute opinion for faith, and therefore you conclude they must be so with the church and with all who receive her as their teacher. Hence you suppose that in submitting to her authority, I am deprived of my freedom of mind, the use of my reason, the liberty of forming my own opinions, and therefore am in spiritual bondage, under a degrading and spiritual despotism"

"Certainly; that is my view."

"But as you are not infallible, it is possible that you are wrong. The church does no violence to my reason or understanding in exacting my belief in or assent to the creed she teaches, any more than the mathematician does in exacting my assent to his axioms or his demonstrations, because

the creed is the truth, received on the veracity of God revealing it, not an opinion which may or may not be true."

"Authority commands, it does not reason. You feel yourself bound to believe what the church teaches, but this sense of obligation is not a rational conviction. Authority may silence reason, but does not convince it. It may well happen that if you exercise your reason, it will dictate one thing while the church commands you to believe another. Yet you must submit and refuse to follow or hear your own reason. This is why I term your church a spiritual despotism, and denounce her as the enemy of reason, and the grave of all free thought."

"The internal conflict between reason and the church in the bosom of her members, which you suppose, is impossible, if they know the grounds of their faith, and all may know them. I have all my life thought and reasoned as freely as most men; I have read and studied the substance of all that sectarians, Jews, infidels, rationalists, naturalists, pantheists, and atheists have written against the church, and I believe I am ignorant of no important objection urged from any quarter against her; and yet I have never for a moment found her and my reason in conflict, for my reason has always assured me that nothing is or can be more reasonable than to believe on the authority of God's revealed word duly accredited as his word."

"You have only the word of your church, composed of fallible men, that what you are required to believe is the revealed word of God."

"I have the testimony of a divinely instituted, commissioned, and assisted body, reaching in unbroken unity and continuity from our Lord and his apostles down to me, to be the witness of the fact of revelation, and therefore a witness amply competent to accredit it to me and to all men and nations. In believing what the church teaches, I believe the word of God, and am satisfied, as thoroughly convinced, as I could be by any demonstration in Euclid."

"You forget that I have denied the fact of the divine commission."

"I do not forget it, but I do not heed it. You gave no valid reason for your denial. You are confessedly fallible, and your denial, made on no authority, can have no value."

"But have you no authority for asserting the divine commission but my alleged inability to disprove it?"

"I have. But in a discussion with you, the reasons I

have already assigned, and which I need not repeat, are amply sufficient. The fact of the historical continuity of the church from the apostles to us, always claiming it, professedly acting under it, and having her claim from the first conceded, is enough for any reasonable man. To a believer I could give additional and even stronger reasons, drawn from the very nature and design of Christianity as the means of the redemption, moral and spiritual progress, and final beatitude of the human race, but what I have said must suffice, unless you take avowedly the ground of rationalism or naturalism."

"Suppose I should take that ground, what would you do? Many, even amongst Protestants, have maintained that Protestantism is illogical, and inconsistent with itself; either too much or too little; too much, if God has made no revelation, too little, if he has; for it leaves us without any certain means of determining what it is he has revealed, which it is derogatory from the character of God to suppose he either could or would do. There is no question that Protestantism leaves all Protestants who think in doubt and uncertainty as to what God has revealed, if he has revealed any thing. I have no sympathy with the church, but I own it has a logical consistency with itself that Protestantism, as a system of religion, has not. I adhere to the reformation, not for its doctrines, but as the uprising of the human mind against the intolerable despotism of Rome. But what have you to say in defence of your church against one who takes the ground of rationalism or pure naturalism?"

"To one who takes it by way of argument or banter, nothing; to one who takes it seriously I should have much to say. I should undertake to convince him, by arguments he could not deny, that neither nature nor reason suffices for itself; that nothing is more unnatural than naturalism, or irrational than rationalism; that neither does or can explain either the origin or the end of the universe in general, or of man in particular. Then I should show him that the natural is impossible without the supernatural, and that reason cannot, by her own light or revelation, solve her own problems. Having shown this, I should proceed to show him that revelation is possible, is in accordance with the order of divine Providence as manifested in nature, and therefore capable of being accredited by ordinary testimony. After that I should prove to him the historical fact of revelation, that it was made to man in the beginning, and that in

no age or nation has man ever been left entirely without it; and close my argument by showing him that the revelation made in the garden, and in substance the only revelation that has ever been made to man, is identically the Christian revelation transmitted through the patriarchs and the synagogue, preserved and taught in its purity and integrity by the Catholic Church. This would cover the whole ground, and meet all the objections of every class of objectors, from whatever point of view they object."

"I will not put you to the trouble of doing that, Reverend Father. I really do not take interest enough in the question to discuss it, or to listen to its discussion. All I demand is free, untrammelled thought for myself, and for all men and on all subjects. Your church does not allow it, and therefore I hold every true man should oppose her, and do his best to make away with her."

"Do you demand free thought so as to be able to arrive at the truth?"

"I demand it so as to be able to exercise and develop my faculties as a man, and not be kept always in leading-strings as a child."

"Still, I presume, you would like to think wisely and justly. We have agreed that truth is something real, independent of us, and that there is the right to which we ought to conform our thoughts, words, and deeds. Are you under no obligation to do the right when you know it, or to believe the truth when made known to you?"

"I regard all authoritative teaching, in matters of religion, as hostile to religious liberty; what I believe or disbelieve makes no difference. I say with Pope, nominally, at least, a member of your own church:

> 'For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
> His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.'

The important thing is, not what a man thinks or believes, but what he does."

XII.—I was sorry that the editor did not give the priest the opportunity to develop and establish his several points in defence of the church against rationalism; but it was clear that however deep the editor's hostility to all authoritative teaching, he was really indifferent to all religion, and had no wish to believe in any. The only thing that he seemed in earnest about, was to get rid for himself and

others of all positive belief of any kind. He had no serious convictions, and no earnest desire to know and believe the truth. It seemed clear to me that he thought he had an advantage of the priest, and that he was disposed to press it. There is no denying that the church does claim to teach by authority, and to govern in spiritual matters her own members; and this age and country hold all authority in horror, and call it, however legitimate, just, and necessary, despotism. The journalist would recognize no distinction between just and unjust authority. All authority, in that it is authority, was for him despotism, and destructive of liberty. He would have no restraint in thought, word, or deed placed on any one; but every one should be free to live as he lists, unless, perchance, he adhered to the Catholic Church. He understood perfectly that the priest could not and would not concede this unbounded license, and thought, if he could only force him to deny it, he could then raise the cry of despotism against the church with some appearance of justice, or with some plausibility. I was not pleased with him; for the principle of authority in matters of faith no man who believes in revelation at all can deny. We Protestants hold the principle of authority in faith as really as Catholics do, only we believe the authority on which we are to receive the revelation is the Bible, the infallible witness of what God has revealed, while Catholics hold that the authority, the infallible witness, is the church.

But is it, after all, more difficult for Catholics to prove the infallibility of the church than it is for us to prove the infallible authority of the Scriptures? The Bible is authoritative, because written by men divinely inspired to write it. How do I prove their inspiration? By the miracles of our Lord and his apostles. But how can miracles prove that? None but God can work a real miracle, and miracles therefore simply accredit those in whose behalf they are wrought as messengers from God, who could not work them unless God were with them, and God could not work miracles to accredit false witnesses or lying messengers. They are the seal of the divine commission that God gives to his messengers, or ambassadors, to speak in his name. Then if those thus accredited say they are inspired to reveal his word, they are so. We believe the writers of the Holy Scriptures were inspired, because, being divinely accredited as his messengers, they are so. We must, then, prove the divine commission of the apostles, before we can prove they

were inspired, or that the sacred Scriptures were written by divine inspiration. All rests, then, on the fact of the divine commission of the apostles. With us, as well as with Catholics, this is the vital element. They, then, to prove the infallibility of the church, have to prove only the same fact that we must prove in order to prove the infallibility of the Bible. If they can prove, as they say they can, that their church is apostolic, that it continues without break the apostolate, its word is as high authority for what God has revealed as is the Bible itself, and the faith of Catholics is as reasonable, to say the least, as that of Protestants. I must think of this.

"You hold, then," replied the priest, "that it makes no difference what a man believes, if his life is in the right. Would what would be a right life in a pig, be a right life in a man?"

"Not at all; for man is the superior animal."

"Would it make no difference in regard to his life, whether a man believed as you do, or on the contrary, that the life of the pig is the proper human life?"

"Perhaps it would."

"Then it is not a matter of absolute indifference what a man believes. Man has, you have conceded, a moral nature, and therefore moral relations—relations to his Creator, to his neighbor, to society, and to the state. If so, he has certain duties as well as rights, which grow out of these several relations. Is the life of him in the right who neglects these duties, pays no attention to them, denies that he is under any obligation to perform them, that his neighbor has any rights he is bound to respect, and insists on his right to live as he lists?"

"I say not that."

"After all, is a man's life, on the whole, any thing but a more or less imperfect practical application of his belief and that of the community in which he lives? I leave out, of course, exceptional characters, great rogues and great criminals, who are the slaves of untamed passions, and yet even these are not uniformly wicked in their whole lives, and perhaps the larger portion of their lives is inoffensive. I speak only of the generality of men."

"I have known atheists whose conduct might shame many Christians."

"But they had been born and bred in a Christian community, and formed under the influence of Christian mor-

als, manners, customs, and civilization. The habits of early life remain and influence the conduct after the faith which formed them is gone. This is no fair test. The fair test would be to take, if you could find one, a nation of atheists, with only atheistical traditions, trained under atheistical influences, without regard to moral obligation, living without restraint, and with no other rule of conduct than the calculations of interest, or the impulses of passion."

"I do not deny morality, nor the obligations of duty."

"If you concede moral obligations you must assert the existence of God, for only God can impose an obligation. Human laws derive all their vigor as laws, from the law of God, which is his own eternal will or reason. There can be no moral obligation without a moral law, and creatures do not and cannot create the moral law, for it is above them, and prescribes to them what they ought and what they ought not to do."

"But they may be a law unto themselves."

"Yes; if God has placed his law in their reason and instincts, and written it in their hearts, not otherwise. But even if so, it is none the less a law ordained by the legislator who has the right over them, and to prescribe their conduct. A man is no less bound by the dictates of reason than by the precepts of an external law. Sins against the dictates of reason are the least excusable of all sins. Without God, then, no moral law; without the moral law, no moral obligation, no morality; without morality, based on the moral law, no state, no wise or just politics. Does it make no difference, then, whether men believe in God or deny him, and hold themselves accountable for their conduct in the several relations of life, or not?"

"But that does not prove that in order to determine what is a proper human life, it is necessary to know and believe all the dogmas your church teaches."

"All in good time. It is necessary to believe in God. Is it less necessary that we should, as far as concerns our relations to him, believe what is true of him, or will it answer as well to believe what is not true?"

"Proceed: say, what is true."

"Then it will be necessary to know or believe our true and real relation to him, the fact that he creates us, the end for which he creates us, the law under which he places us; also, our true relations to the rest of his creatures, to nature or the external universe, to our fellow-men, or to one an-

other, as husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, neighbors, citizens or subjects, magistrates or rulers."

"Be it so."

"No less important or necessary will it be that we understand what are, and how we are to use, the true and efficient means of discharging the religious, moral, domestic, social, and political duties that grow out of our several relations in life—of fulfilling the law under which we are placed, and gaining the end for which we are made."

"Be it so, again."

"Well, my dear journalist, the principles, the dogmas, the teachings of the church go no further than this; they only cover the several points on which every one in his degree and according to his state in life, needs to be rightly instructed from earliest childhood, if his life is to be in the right. Your mistake, my dear sir, as that of many others, arises from your not perceiving the practical character of the dogmatic teaching of the church, and from supposing that her dogmas are merely speculative opinions, which have and can have no practical bearing on the real business of life. Hence your disdain or contempt of theology, and the disgust with which you look on the earnestness and warmth with which theologians discuss what to you are idle or senseless questions. Gibbon somewhere says with a sneer, in relation to the discussion between the homoousians and the homoiousians, the Christian world, for a hundred years, disputed and cut each others' throats for a single diphthong. True; yet in that diphthong was involved the whole question, whether the human race, after three hundred years of martyrdom, and when just emerging from the catacombs, was to be replunged into the idolatry, superstition, and barbarism of effete heathenism, or to go forward to the light and glory, the peace and happiness of Christian worship and Christian civilization. The whole future of humanity in this world and the next was at stake. The Athanasians, the Catholics, were the party of the future, of progress, of truth, of Christian civilization; the Arians were the party of the past, seeking to retain the human race in the bonds of heathen error, superstition, and idolatry; for like the heathen they paid divine honors to one they held to be not God but a creature. Theological disputes you see, my worthy journalist, that seem to you trifling, nonsensical even, may, nevertheless, have a deep significance, and involve the gravest practical consequences. It is a sad proof

of modern progress, the low rank you liberals or rationalists assign to theological science. They were deeper and sounder thinkers, and wiser men, who called theology "the queen of the sciences."

"But, Reverend Father, you seem to have changed sides, and to have become the advocate of progress, the champion of the future."

"No more than I have been all along. It is you and your friends, my dear sir, who are the enemies of progress. You seek to deprive humanity of all it has accumulated by the labors of all past generations, to reduce it to utter nakedness, and turn it out into a bleak and wintry world to starve, freeze, and die. I would preserve all that has been gained, and especially the living principles and practical truths, without which there may be destruction, but no progress, because no continuity of life. You and the party you sympathize with would render progress impossible if you could have your own way; for you would place the human race back in the darkness and slavery from which the church has rescued it with so much toil and suffering, and by so many martyrdoms. You tell us nothing the world has not known and tried before the advent of our Lord, except what you have borrowed from the church herself. You have borrowed, indeed, from her the very idea of progress, of which you will find no recognition in the writings even of the most eminent of gentile philosophers, and you will seek in vain in the gentile world for any practical progress, unless in the material order. The gentile nations had all the nature that we have, and yet their moral, and intellectual, and social progress, was null. Their religious history is a history of a continuous deterioration, and the noble truths which you find in a Plato or a Cicero, were not new discoveries or new developments, but confessedly borrowed from the wisdom of the ancients, and which later generations had forgotten or obscured. You see repeated the same history in China, in Turkey, in all contemporary pagan and Mohammedan states and nations. Christian nations alone are living and progressive nations. And never have Christian nations advanced in all that makes the true glory of civilization so rapidly as they did from the downfall of Rome to the rise of what you call the reformation.

"The reason of this," continued the priest, "is plain enough. The church is always present in these nations,

asserting the principles, and the means and conditions of all true progress, and aiding in their application to individual, social, and political life. She furnishes the principles, and assists in their continuous explication and application. Here is the reason why Christian nations, truly such, are living and progressive nations, and why non-Christian nations are neither living nor progressive. All heresies and infidelity are disintegrating and destructive, if you will, but really hostile to progress. They interrupt the work of the church, they interpose obstacles to her influence, deny or obscure the principles of progress, and as far as their power extends, so prevent their development and practical application, and not only peril souls, but hinder or retard the progress of civilization. Heretical nations are running the same career the ancient gentile nations ran, and their influence, aided by the flesh, the world, and the devil, extends even to orthodox nations, and neutralizes, to a fearful extent, the power of the church to apply her principles to her own children, so that these nations become almost as unprogressive as heretical nations themselves.

"I defend," concluded the priest, "progress, but by preserving the principles and institutions by which it is effected; I accept the New, joyfully and gratefully, so far as it grows out of the Old, and is but its development and application under the law prescribed by the true end of man. I war against what the liberals call new, because it is not new, but a revival of what the race has outgrown and thrown off, and because it tends only to destroy all that has been gained during the last eighteen hundred years. You do not and will not believe me, for you are bent on restoring defunct paganism, though you perhaps know it not. But events are rapidly proving that I am right. Religion is fast losing its hold on the new generation; reverence for the wisdom of the past, the experience of ages, and the universal convictions of mankind, is well-nigh gone, and it seems to be taken for granted that our fathers were all old fogies, and that all wisdom was born with us. The youth of every nation become its counsellors. Men of mature age, and ripe experience, are set aside as too *slow*. Indeed, power passes from men, to women, and boys; and not to the women who veil their faces and listen to the priest, but to women who, with brazen front, spout infidelity under the name of philanthropy or humanity, and bid us forget their sex, and treat them as men. The result will soon be seen."

XIII.—In the evening after the last conversation, the metropolitan editor left us. Whether his duties called him away, or whether he had grown weary of the part he had played, I know not; but I am sure he left us no less and no more prejudiced against the church, no less and no more firm in his belief in the nineteenth century, than before. The priest had made not the slightest impression on his mind. The whole had been for him a sparring match. He did justice to the priest's skill in fence, admired it, and that was all. The priest's words had by no means convinced me, for I could not come at once to look favorably on the church that I had been accustomed, from earliest childhood, to regard as the Mystery of Iniquity, the Sorceress of Babylon, the Mother of Abominations. Had I not been taught that the pope is Antichrist, the veritable Man of Sin,—that the church had apostatized, fallen away from Christ, corrupted the faith, imbruted the nations, and left the worship of the living and true God for the worship of idols, graven images, senseless pictures, and dead men's bones?

It is true, that as I had grown older, and travelled abroad in Catholic as well as in Protestant countries, this early teaching had lost with me much of its sharpness, and been not a little modified; yet the early impression it made on my mind remained, and prevented me from even examining, as I might have done, the practical effects of the doctrine and practices of the church on the members of her communion who really believed her teaching, obeyed her precepts, and practised her morality. The aged priest, at our little watering-place of Springdale, was the first Catholic of whose inner life I had ever caught even the faintest glimpse.

I saw in this meek and modest old man, a man of learning and ability, born to a princely title and vast estates, brought up in wealth and luxury, highly cultivated and refined, foregoing all, making himself poor by his charities, leaving rank and family, country and friends, becoming a hard-working missionary in a foreign land, among a people strangers in speech, manners, and blood, the great majority of whom looked upon his religion with bitter hatred, and upon himself as an emissary of Satan, and where there were only a widely-scattered few who would recognize his sacred calling, ask his services, and who were in general poor and despised, the pariahs of society. With these he had spent, without murmuring or repining, in cheerfulness and gaiety

of heart, forty of the best years of his life, in journeyings from place to place, lodging in miserable shanties, sometimes on the bare ground, teaching the ignorant, consoling the afflicted, recalling the erring, rebuking the sinner, visiting the sick and dying, and burying the dead; often in hunger and thirst, in watchings and fastings, and ready to faint from weariness and exhaustion, and yet never counting his labor and want, his privations and fatigue, holding himself repaid, and more than repaid, if so be he could win souls to Christ, and save his own soul at last. When I saw this, and reflected that he had done only what thousands had done before him, and were still doing, in all parts of the world, I could not but say to myself there must be something deeper and diviner in this old church than we Protestants have believed possible.

The priest resolutely maintained, in some conversations I had with him after the editor had left us, that, except in the material order, due in great measure to the previous discovery by Catholics of this western hemisphere, and in the further extension and practical application of certain great principles always insisted on by the church, there had been no real progress of civilization since the epoch of the reformation. There was a great political and social change in Europe in the fifteenth century, he said, when monarchical centralism triumphed over feudalism which had reigned for four centuries; but whether the change was a progress or not, many students of history and society think is quite doubtful. The change, as far as he had been able to understand it, consisted, he said, in principle at least, in a return to what may be called the Græco-Roman order of civilization, which had been weakened but not destroyed by the barbarian invasion of the empire. The change has certainly been in favor of monarchy, and, in the more advanced nations of Europe, has resulted in the reëstablishment of cæsarism.

The struggle now going on in Europe, the echo of which affects the American system most disastrously, he said, is the attempt to substitute democratic absolutism for monarchical absolutism, as it was in England during what is called the English rebellion in the seventeenth century, and in the French revolution in the eighteenth, not yet ended. The party of democratic absolutism is regarded, just now, as the party of progress, the party of the future, the party of humanity, and because it represents the spirit of the age and

promises the race unbounded liberty and an earthly paradise. What favors it is approved; what opposes it is condemned. Would you oppose the people, pit yourself against your age, and repress its aspirations? Yet both absolutisms are founded on falsehood, for they are founded on man, and man, either individually or collectively, is not absolute, but dependent and relative.

"But liberalism is the great word of the day. No human institution is strong enough to resist it, and it would, if it were possible, sweep away the divine. Its force is the force of passion, not reason. You began your movement by rejecting the authority of the pope and councils, and asserting that of the Bible interpreted by private illumination or by private judgment, and have gone on and denied the authority of the Bible, and asserted, first, that of the interior spirit, and then, that of reason alone. You have been forced, by the light of your liberal movement, to go further, and reject the interior spirit, to reason and to restrict yourselves to the senses, and finally to the passions and instincts of the people. You have lost faith, lost hope in another world, resolved God into man, and man into a mere animal —probably the tadpole or monkey developed. To this you have been forced, step after step, and you call it progress! You have got rid of the spiritual order, emancipated what you regard as the advanced portion of mankind—the only portion in your estimation worth counting—from the restraints of all law except the physical laws of your constitution and those of the universe; have discarded all moral ideas as vain illusions, and are reduced, naked and alone, to your own passions and lusts. You have proclaimed people-king, people-priest, people-God, and made popular opinion, fickle as the wind, your law, your criterion of right and wrong. Under your progress in losing, poverty increases in greater ratio than wealth, the poor become more and more abject and servile, and are treated as unfortunates or criminals. Intelligence is lowered, minds lose their vigor, characters are enfeebled and abased, and man loses his dignity, his personal freedom and independence.

"Yet you applaud yourselves for the wonderful progress you have made, and for your immeasurable superiority over the generations that went before you. The evils to which we call your attention, and which you were told beforehand would inevitably follow your course, you excuse as the necessary incidents of the transition state through which you

are passing, and trust they will disappear when you have left the old completely behind, and have fully established the new. Alas! you are always in a transition state. You started from passion, not reason; from falsehood, not truth; from a false, not a true principle; and how can you expect to arrive at any thing fixed, solid, and permanent? You are following an illusion, a will-o'-the-wisp, and can hardly escape being caught in the bogs or sunk in the quagmire at last.

"You were warned in the beginning of the danger you run, of the inevitable consequences of the false principle you adopted, and you called those who told you the truth, and begged you to heed their words, 'fools' and 'asses.' Even to-day you mock at us who try to rend the veil from your eyes, dispel your illusions, and enable you to see things as they are; you get angry at us, abuse us, call us moral cowards, dwellers among the tombs, worshippers of the dead past, with our eyes on the back side of our heads, lovers of darkness and haters of light, deniers of God and enemies of man. We are your enemies, forsooth, because we tell you the truth, and insist that it is truth, not error, that gives freedom to the mind, strength and energy to reason, elevation and dignity to character.

"The church has always and everywhere," he continued, "had to struggle with the world, and always and everywhere will you find much, even in Catholic countries, to deplore; for never yet, even in professedly Catholic states, have the evil passions and ignorance of statesmen, and the blindness and ambition of rulers left her an open field and fair play. The Philistines, moreover, have always continued to dwell in the land. Yet you must have been struck in your travels with the moral elevation and personal dignity of the Catholic peasantry, and their freedom from the debasing servility to rank and wealth, from which the poor are not by any means free even in democratic America. The poor in Catholic countries are never abject as a class, and retain, even when beggars, a certain self-respect, personal dignity, and independence of feeling. They feel that

'A man's a man for a' that.'

Compare a Spanish or an Irish peasant with an English peasant, and my meaning is at once apparent. Did it ever occur to you that this superior moral elevation and personal dignity and independence of the Catholic poor are due to

their religion, which attaches merit to voluntary poverty, regards the poor as blest and a blessing, and never treats them as an unfortunate class, or poverty as an evil, far less as a crime? These modern bastiles, called poor-houses, in which the poor are shut up as criminals, are not Catholic constructions, and I think you have never seen in Catholic countries, as I have in this country, the poor set up at auction in town-meeting, and knocked down to the lowest bidder, or person who would take and keep them at the least expense to the town. In Catholic states public charities and corrections are seldom classed together and placed in charge of one and the same board of commissioners.

"There was no little barbarism in the temper and manners of what are called 'the dark ages,' inherited from pagan Rome even more than from the German barbarian; but you will look in vain among your non-Catholic contemporaries for that clearness and vigor of intellect, and that moral elevation, force, and independence of individual character, which you meet everywhere in mediæval society. If there were great crimes in those ages, they were followed, as the historian of the Monks of the West justly remarks, by grand expiations. If there was great pride, there was deeper humility, and always will the period from the sixth to the end of the fifteenth century stand out as the most glorious in the annals of the race.

"The movement party curses those ages, and for a century and a half has been engaged in a huge levelling process, which, while it has done really nothing to elevate the depressed, and has really injured the poor by multiplying their wants, and aggravating their discontent, has brought down all elevations to the low level of commonplace. The progress you boast consists chiefly in losing the rich faith, the high principle, the elevated character, and the sublime ideal cherished by the church, and in reducing all moral, intellectual, individual, and social eminences to a general average, where the race stagnates and rots."

I will not say the priest was right, that he did not exaggerate, or even adopt a false rule of judgment; but I felt that he had thought longer and far more deeply on the subject than I had. He had evidently mastered the subject to a degree, and studied it in a light that I had not done, and I had no right to regard him as less honest and truthful, or more "one-sided" than myself. He made me feel I knew very little of the real history of my race—that I had

frittered away my time, and that there were depths and analogies even in common things that I had not dreamed of exploring. He showed me at least that I had many things as to the principles and influence of religion and the church to learn, and stimulated me to do all in my power at any age to redeem the time I had lost.

I do not think I shall ever be convinced of the priest's doctrine, and seek admission into the communion of the Catholic Church; but I am thoroughly resolved to investigate, if my life is prolonged, her claims, which I am certain are not as unreasonable or as unfounded as I had hitherto supposed.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH.

[From the Catholic World for October, 1866.]

Our age is more sentimental than intellectual, more philanthropic than Christian, more material than spiritual. It may and no doubt does cherish and seek to realize, with such wisdom as it has, many humane and just sentiments, but it retains less Christian thought than it pretends, and has hardly any conception of catholic principles. It studies chiefly phenomena, physical or psychical, and as these are all individual, particular, manifold, variable, and transitory, it fails to recognize any reality that is universal, invariable, and permanent, superior to the vicissitudes of time and place, always and everywhere one and the same. It is so intent on the sensible that it denies or forgets the spiritual, and so engrossed with the creature that it loses sight of the creator.

Indeed, there are not wanting men in this nineteenth century who deny that there is any creator at all, or that any thing has been made, and maintain that all has been produced by self-development or growth. These men, who pass for the great scientific lights of the age, tell us that all things are in a continual process of self-formation, which they call by the general name of progress; and so taken up are they with their doctrine of progress, that they gravely assert that God himself, if God there be, is progressive, per-

fectible, ever proceeding from the imperfect towards the perfect, and seeking by unremitting action to perfect, fill out, or complete his own being. They seem not to be aware that if the perfect does not already really exist, or is wanting, there is and can be no progress; for progress is motion towards the perfect, and, if the perfect does not exist there can be no motion towards it, and in the nature of the case the motion can be only towards nothing, and therefore, as St. Thomas has well demonstrated in proving the impossibility of progress without end, no motion at all. Nor do they seem any more to be aware that the imperfect, the incomplete, is not and cannot be self-active, or capable of acting in and from itself alone, and therefore has not the power in itself alone to develop and complete itself, or perfect its own being. Creatures may be and are progressive, because they live, and move, and have their being in their Creator, and are aided and sustained by him whose being is eternally complete, who is in himself infinitely perfect. They forget also the important fact that where there is nothing universal, there can be nothing particular, that where there is nothing invariable there can be nothing variable, that where there is nothing permanent there can be nothing transitory, and that where there is no real being there can be no phenomena, any more than there can be creation without a creator, action without an actor, appearance without any thing that appears, or a sign that signifies nothing.

Now the age, regarded in its dominant tendency, neglects or denies this universal, invariable, persistent, real, or spiritual order, and its highest and most catholic principles are mere classifications or generalizations of visible phenomena, and therefore abstractions, without reality, without life or efficiency. It understands not that throughout the universe the visible is symbolical of the invisible, and that to the prepared mind there is an invisible but living reality signified by the observable phenomena of nature, as in the Christian economy an invisible grace is signified by the visible sacramental sign. All nature is in some sense sacramental, but the age takes it only as an empty sign signifying nothing. Hence the embarrassment of the Christian theologian in addressing it; the symbols he uses and must use have for it no meaning. He deals and must deal with an order of thought of which it has little or no conception. He is as one speaking to a man who has no hearing, or ex-

hibiting colors to a man who has no sight. He speaks of the transcendental to those who recognize nothing above the sensible—of the spiritual to men who are of the earth earthy, and have lost the faculty of rising above the material, and piercing beyond the visible. The age has fallen, even intellectually, far below the Christian order of thought, and is apparently unable to rise even in conception to the great catholic principles in accordance with which the universe is created, sustained, and governed.

Nobody in his senses denies that man is progressive, or that modern society has made marvellous progress in the material order, in the application of science to the productive arts. I am no *laudator temporis acti;* I understand and appreciate the advantages of the present, and do not doubt that steam navigation, railroads, and lightning telegraphs, which bid defiance to the winds and waves, and as it were annihilate space and time, will one day be made to subserve higher than mere material interests; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in many and very important respects, the modern world has deteriorated instead of improving, and been more successful in losing than in gaining. The modern nations commonly regarded, at least by themselves, as the more advanced nations, have fallen in moral and religious thought below the ancient Greeks and Romans. They may have more sound dogmas, but they have less conception of principles, of the invisible or spiritual order, excepting always the followers of Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus, whose absurd materialism is revived with hardly any disguise by the most approved thinkers of our own age. The gentiles generally held catholic principles, but misapprehended and misapplied them, and thus fell into gross idolatry and degrading and besotting superstition; but the moderns while retaining many Catholic dogmas have lost the meaning of the word, principle. The Catholic can detect, no doubt, phases of truth in all the doctrines of those outside of the church, but the Christianity they profess has no universal, immutable, and imperishable principle, and degenerates in practice into a blind and fierce fanaticism, a watery sentimentality, a baseless humanitarianism, or a collection of unrelated and unmeaning dogmas, which are retained only because they are never examined, and which can impart no light to the understanding, infuse no life into the heart, and impose no restraint on the appetites and passions.

Having fallen below the conception of a real order above the visible and phenomenal, and sunk to complete Sadducism, which believes in neither angel nor spirit, the age makes war on the church because she asserts such order, and remains fast anchored in it; because she is immovable and invariable, or as her enemies say, stationary, unprogressive, and therefore hostile to progress. She has, it is said, the insolence to attempt to teach and govern men and nations, instead of gracefully submitting to their views and wishes, and bestowing her blessing on their exertions for the liberty and progress of society. The age denies her to be the church of God, because she fails to prove herself to be the church of man, holding simply from a human authority. It denies her divine origin, constitution, and authority, because she is stable, cannot be carried away by every wind of doctrine, does not yield to every popular impulse, and from time to time resists individuals, civil rulers, the people even, and opposes their favorite theories, plans, and measures, whenever she finds them at war with her mission and her law. It applauds her, indeed, to the echo, when she appears to be on the side of what happens to be popular, but condemns her without mercy when she opposes popular error, popular folly, popular injustice, and asserts the unpopular truth, defends the unpopular cause, or uses her power and influence in behalf of neglected justice, and pleads with her divine eloquence for the poor, the wronged, the down-trodden. Yet this is precisely what she should do, if the church of God, and what it would be contrary to her nature and office on that supposition not to do.

The age concedes nothing to the unseen and eternal. In its view religion itself is human, and ought to be subject to man, and determinable by society, dictated by the people, who in the modern mind usurp the place of God. It should not govern, but be governed, and governed from below, not from above; or rather, in its subversion of old ideas, it holds that being governed from below is being governed from above. It forgets that religion, objectively considered, is, if any thing, the revelation and assertion of the divine order, or the universal and eternal law of God, the introduction and maintenance in the practical affairs of men and nations of the divine element, without which there would and could be nothing in human society invariable, permanent, or stable—persistent, independent, supreme, or authoritative. The church is simply the divine constitution and

organ of religion in society, and must, like religion itself, be universal, invariable, independent, supreme, and authoritative for all men and nations. Man does not originate the church. She does not depend on man, or hold from him either individually or collectively; for she is instituted to govern him, to administer for him the universal and eternal law, and to direct and assist him in conducting himself in the way of his duty, to his supreme good, which she could not do if she held from and depended on him.

The point here insisted on, and which is so far removed from the thought of this age, is, that this order transcending the phenomenal and the whole material or sensible universe, and which in the strictly philosophical language of Scripture is called "the Law of the Lord," is eminently real, not imaginary, not factitious, not an abstraction, not a classification or generalization of particulars, nor something that depends for its reality on human belief or disbelief. Religion which asserts this divine order, this transcendental order, is objectively "the law of the Lord," which, proceeding from the eternal reason and will of God, is the principle and reason of things. The church, as the divinely constituted organ of that law, is not an arbitrary institution, is not an accident, is not an afterthought, is not a superinduction upon the original plan of the Creator, but enters integrally into that plan, and is therefore founded in the principle, the reason, and the constitution of things, and is that in reference to which all things are created, sustained, and governed, and hence our Lord is called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

But this our age does not conceive. For it the divine, the invariable, the universal, and the eternal are simply abstractions or generalizations, not real being. Its only conception of immensity, is space unlimited—of eternity, is time without end—of the infinite, the undefined, and of the universal, totality or sum total. *Catholic*, in its understanding, means accepting or ranking together as equally respectable the doctrines, opinions, views, and sentiments of all sects and denominations, Christian, Jewish, Mahometan, and pagan. He, in the sense of modern philosophers, has a catholic disposition who respects all convictions, and has no decided conviction of his own. Catholicity is held to be something made up by the addition of particulars. The age does not understand that there is no catholicity without unity, and therefore that catholicity is not predicable of the

material order, since nothing material or visible is or can be strictly one and universal. The church is catholic, not because as a visible body she is universal and includes all men and nations in her communion; she was as strictly catholic when her visible communion was restricted to the Blessed Virgin and the apostles as she is now, or would be if all the members of the race were recipients of her sacraments. She is catholic because she is the organ of the whole spiritual order, truth, or reality, and that order in its own intrinsic nature is one and universal. All truth is catholic, because all truth is one and invariable; all the dogmas of the church are catholic, because universal principles, always and everywhere true. The law of the Lord is catholic, because universally, always and everywhere law, equally law for all men and nations in every age of the world, on earth and in heaven, in time and eternity. The church is catholic, because she holds under this law, and because God promulgates and administers it through her, because he lives and reigns in her, and hence she is called his kingdom, the kingdom of God on earth, a kingdom fulfilled and completed in heaven. It is this order of ideas that the age loses sight of, and is so generally disposed to deny. Yet without it there were no visible order, and nothing would or could exist.

The principle, reason, nature, or constitution of things is in this order, and men must conform to it or live no true, no real life. They who recede from it advance towards nothing, and, as far as possible, become nothing. The church is independent, superior to all human control, and persistent, unaltered, and unalterable through all the vicissitudes of time and place because the order in which she is founded is independent and persistent. She cannot be moved or harmed, because she rests on the principle, truth, and constitution of things, and is founded neither on the individual man, the state, nor the people, but on God himself, the Rock of Ages, against which any thing created must rage and beat in vain. "On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall shall not prevail against it." The church is therefore, by her own divine constitution, by the very principle and law of her existence, indefectible. No weapon forged against her shall prosper. The wicked may conspire for her destruction, but in vain, because they conspire to destroy reality, and all reality is always invincible and indestructible. They cannot efface

or overthrow her because she is founded in the truth and reality of things, or what is the same thing, in the unalterable reason and will of God, in whom all creatures have their principle—live, move, and have their being.

They who oppose the church in the name of humanity or human progress, cannot succeed, because she is invincible, and they would utterly defeat themselves if they could. They would deprive the human race of the law of God, which makes wise the simple and strengthens the weak, and deprive men and nations of the truth and reality of things, the very principle of all life, and of the very means and conditions of all progress. Man no doubt is progressive, but not in and by himself alone. Archimedes demanded a *πού στῶ*, a whereon to rest his fulcrum outside of the earth, in order to move it, and there is no conceivable way by which a man can raise himself by a lever supported on himself. How is it that our philosophers fail to see the universal application of the laws which they themselves assert? All progress is by assimilation, by accretion, as that hierophant of progress, Pierre Leroux, has amply demonstrated, and if there is no reality outside of man or above him, what is there for him to assimilate, and how is he to become more than at any given time he already is? Swift ridiculed the philosophers of Laputa, who labored to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, but even more ridiculous are they who pretend that something may be assimilated from nothing, or that a thing can in and of itself make itself more than it is. Where there is nothing above man with which he does or may commune, there is for him no possibility of progress, and men and nations can never advance beyond what they are. This is so in the nature of things, and it is only what is implied in the maxim, *Ex nihilo nihil fit.*

An institution, no matter by what sacred name called, founded by savages, embodying only what they are, and worked by them, would have no power to elevate them above their savage state, and could only serve to perpetuate their savagery. The age speaks of the applications of science to the productive arts, of the marvels of the steam-engine, steamboats, the locomotive, and the magnetic telegraph, and boasts that it renders mind omnipotent over matter. Vain boast, poor philosophy. We have in these things gained no triumph over matter, no control over the forces of nature, which are as independent of our reason and

will as ever they were, as the first steamboat explosion will suffice to convince the most sceptical. We have subjected none of the forces of nature; we have only learned in some few instances to construct our machinery so as to be propelled by them, as did the first man who built a mill, constructed a boat, or spread his sails to catch the breeze. We alter not, we control not by our machinery the forces of nature, and all the advantage we have obtained is in conforming to them, and in suffering them, according to their own laws, or laws which we have not imposed on them, to operate for us. The principle is universal, catholic, and as true in the moral or spiritual as in the mechanical or physical world.

Man does not create, generate, or control the great moral and spiritual forces on which he depends to propel his moral and spiritual machinery. They exist and operate independently alike of his reason and his will, and the advantages he derives from them are obtained by his placing himself within the sphere of their influence, or, to be strictly correct, by interposing voluntarily no obstacle to their inflowing, for they are always present and operative unless resisted. Withdraw him from their influence, or induce him obstinately to resist them, which he may do, for he is a free moral agent, and he can make no more progress than a sailing ship at sea in a dead calm. These forces are divine, are embodied in the church as her living and constitutive force—are in one sense the church herself, and hence men and nations separated from her communion and influence are thrown back on nature alone, and necessarily cease to be progressive. We may war against this as much as we please, but we cannot alter it, for the principle on which it rests is a universal and indestructible law.

Individuals and nations separated by schism or heresy from the visible communion of the church do not become at once absolutely and in all respects unprogressive, for they are carried on for a time by the momentum she has given them, and besides, they are not, as she continues to exist, absolutely beyond or outside of the sphere of her influence, though indirect and reflected. But from the moment of the separation their progress begins to slacken, their spiritual life becomes sickly and attenuated, and gradually they lose all that they had received from the church, and lapse into helpless and unassisted nature. This, which is demonstrable *a priori*, is proved by the experience of those

nations that separated from the church in the sixteenth century. These nations at first retained a large portion of their old Catholic culture, and many of the habits acquired under the discipline and training of the church. But they have been gradually losing them ever since, and the more advanced portions of them have got pretty clear of them, and thrown off, as they express it, the last rag of popery. Indeed this is their boast.

In throwing off the authority of the church, they came in religious matters under the authority of the state, or the temporal sovereign or ruler—a purely human authority, without competency in spirituals—and thus lost at once their entire religious freedom, or liberty of conscience. In Catholic nations the civil authority has always, or almost always, been prone to encroach on the authority of the church, and to attempt to control her external discipline or ecclesiastical administration; but, in the nations that were carried away by the so-called reformation, the civil authority assumed in every instance complete control over the national church, and prescribed its constitution, its creed, its liturgy, and its discipline. This for them completely humanized religion, and made it a department of state. It is true these nations professed to recognize the Bible as containing a divine revelation, and to be governed by it; and this would have been something, even much, had they not remitted its interpretation to the civil magistrate, the king, the parliament, the public judgment of the people, or the private judgment of the individual, which made its meaning, as practically received, vary from nation to nation, and even from individual to individual.

This sacrificed, in principle, the sovereignty of God and the entire spiritual order, departed to a fearful distance from the truth and reality of things, and if it retained some of the precepts of the Christian law, it retained them as precepts not of the law of God but as precepts of the law of man, enjoined, explained, and applied by a purely human authority. In process of time, the authority of the state in religious matters was found to be usurped, tyrannical, and oppressive, and the thinking part of the separated nations asserted the right of private judgment, or of each believer to interpret the Holy Scriptures for himself. Having gone thus far, they went still further, and asserted for every one the right to judge for himself not only of the meaning, but of the inspiration, authenticity, and authority of the Script-

ures, though the civil government in none of these nations, except the United States, not in existence at the time of the separation, has disavowed its authority in spirituals. Practically, the doctrine that each individual judges for himself is now generally adopted.

The authority of the Scriptures has followed the authority of the church, and is practically, when not theoretically, rejected. It was perhaps asserted by the reformers at first for the purpose of presenting some authority not precisely human, which no Catholic would deny, as offset against that of the church, rather than from any deep reverence for it, or profound conviction of its reality. But, be this as it may, it counts for little now. The authors of "Essays and Reviews," and the Anglican bishop of Natal, take hardly less liberty with the Scriptures than Luther and Calvin did with the church. The more advanced thinkers, if thinkers they are, of the age go further still, and maintain not only that a man may be a very religious man, and a true follower of Jesus Christ, without accepting either the authority of the church or that of the Bible, but without even believing either in the existence of God or the immortality of the soul. Schleiermacher, the great Berlin preacher, went thus far in his "Discourses on Religion, addressed to the Cultivated among its Despisers;" and equally far, if not further, in the same direction, go the rising school or sect called positivists. Religion is reduced to a spontaneous development—perhaps I should say, to a secretion of human nature, implying no reality above or distinguishable from human nature itself.

It is not pretended that all persons in these nations have as yet reached this result; but as there is a certain logic in error as well as in truth, all are tending and must tend to it. What is called progress of religious ideas or religious enlightenment is not held to consist in any accession to our stock of known truth, in penetrating further into the world of reality, and attaining a firmer grasp of its principles, nor in a better understanding of our moral relations and the duties growing out of them, but in simply casting off or getting rid of so-called popery—of every thing that has been retained in the nations, and the sects into which they divide and subdivide, furnished by the Catholic Church in which the reformers had been reared—and in reducing men and nations to the nakedness and feebleness of nature. The more advanced portion are already seen sporting *in puris naturalibus*, heedless alike of shame and winter's cold.

The others are following more or less rapidly in the same direction; for there is no halting-place between Catholicity and naked naturalism, and men must either ascend to the one or descend to the other. But those who choose to descend can find no resting-place even in naturalism, for nature, severed from Catholicity, is severed from its principle, is severed from God, from the reality and truth of things, and is therefore unreal, nothing. Hence the descent is endless. Falsehood has no bottom, is unreal, purely negative, and can furnish no standing. Men can stand only on the true, the real, and that is Catholicity, the order represented in society by the church. Those who forsake the church, Catholicity, God, forsake therefore the real order, have nothing to stand on, and in the nature of the case can only drop into what the Scripture calls "the bottomless pit."

We hear much of the ignorance, superstition, and even of idolatry of Catholics, nothing of which is true; but this much is certain, that those who abandon the church, and succeed in humanizing religion, making it hold from man and subject to his control, do as really worship gods of their fashioning as did the old worshippers of gods made of wood and stone, because their religion is really only what they make it, and fall into as gross an idolatry and into as besotted and besotting a superstition as can be found among any heathen people, ancient or modern.

It is easy therefore to understand why the church sets her face so resolutely against modern reformers, liberals, revolutionists, in a word, the whole so-called movement party, professing to labor for the diffusion of intelligence and the promotion of science, liberty, and human progress. It is not science, liberty, or progress that she opposes, but false theories substituted for science, and the wrong and destructive means and methods of promoting liberty and progress adopted and insisted on by liberals and revolutionists. There is only one right way of effecting the progress they profess to have at heart, and that is by conforming to truth and reality, for falsehood is impotent, and nothing can be gained by it. She opposes the movement party, not as a movement party, not as a party of light, liberty, and progress, but as a party moving in the wrong direction, putting forth unscientific theories, theories which amuse the imagination without enlightening the understanding, which if they dazzle it is only to blind with their false glitter, which embraced as truth to-day, must be rejected as falsehood to-

morrow, and which in fact tend only to destroy liberty, and render all real progress impossible. As the party, collectively or individually, neither is nor pretends to be infallible, the church, at the worst, is as likely to be right as they are, and the considerations presented prove that she is right, and that they are wrong. There is no science but in knowing the truth, that which really is or exists, and there is no real progress, individual or social, with nature alone, because nature alone has no existence, and can exist and become more than it is only by the gracious, the supernatural assistance of God, in whom all things live, move, and have their being.

A great clamor has been raised by the whole movement party throughout the world against the encyclical of the Holy Father, dated at Rome, December 8, 1864, and even some Catholics, not fully aware of the sense and reach of the opinions censured, were at first partially disturbed by it; but the Holy Father has given in it only a proof of his pastoral vigilance, the fidelity of the church to her divine mission, and the continuous presence in her and supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost. The errors condemned are all aimed at the unity and invariability, universality and persistency, of truth, the reality of things, the supremacy of the spiritual order, and the independence and authority of the divine law, at real science, and the means and conditions of both liberty and progress. In it we see the great value of the independence of the church,—of a church holding from God instead of holding from man. If the church had been human or under human control, she would never have condemned those errors, because nearly all of them are popular, and hailed as truth by the age. Man condemns only what man dislikes, and the popular judgment condemns only what is unpopular. It is only the divine that judges according to truth, and without being influenced by the spirit of the age, or by what is popular or unpopular. If the church had been human, she would have been carried away by those errors, and proved herself the enemy instead of the friend, the protector, and the benefactor of society.

These remarks on the divine character and independence of the church are not inappropriate to the present times, and may serve to calm, comfort, and console Catholics amidst the national convulsions and changes which, without the reflections they suggest, might deeply afflict the Catholic heart. The successes of Italy and Prussia in the recent unjustifiable

war against Austria, and the humiliation of the Austrian empire, the last of the great powers on which the church could rely for the protection of her material interests, have apparently given over the temporal government of this world to her enemies. There is at this moment not a single great power in the world that is officially Catholic, or that officially recognizes the Catholic Church as the church of God. The majority of Frenchmen are or profess to be Catholics, but the French state professes no religion, and if it pays a salary to the Catholic clergy, Protestant ministers, and Jewish rabbis, it is not as ministers of religion, but as servants of the state. The Russian state is schismatic, and officially anti-papal; the British state, as a state, is Protestant, and officially hostile to the church; Italy follows France; and Prussia, which at the moment means Germany, is officially Protestant and anti-Catholic; and so are Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway. Belgium and our own great republic profess officially no religion, but give freedom and protection to all religions not held to be *contra bonos mores*. Spain and Portugal, no longer great powers, and most of the Central and South American states, officially profess the Catholic faith, but they count for next to nothing in the array of nations. Hellas and the Principalities, like Russia, are schismatic, and the rest of the world, including the greater part of Asia and all of Africa, is Mahometan or pagan, and of course hostile to the church.

I have not enumerated Austria, for what is to be her fate no one can now say; but as a portion of her population belong to the Greek schismatic church, and a larger portion still are Protestants, the most that can be expected of her is that she will, in regard to religion, assume the attitude of France and Italy. There is then really no power on which the church can now rely for the support of her external and material interests. I will not say that the triumph of Prussia is the triumph of Protestantism, for that would not be true; but it is, at least for the moment, the success of the party that denounced the papal encyclical, and would seem to be a complete victory, perhaps a final victory, over that system of mixed civil and ecclesiastical government which grew up on the downfall of the Roman empire and the conversion of the barbarian nations that seated themselves on its ruins. It is the total and final destruction of the Christian empire founded, with the aid of the pope and bishops, by Charlemagne and his nobles, and not unlikely will end

in the complete severance of all official union of church and state—alike the official union between the state and the heretical and schismatic churches, and between the state and the Catholic Church; so that throughout the civilized world the people will be politically free to be of any religion they choose, and the state of no religion.

This result is already reached in nearly all the nations hitherto called Catholic nations, but not in the officially Protestant and schismatic nations; and for a long time to come the anti-Catholic or anti-papal religions, schismatical, heretical, Mahometan, and pagan religions, will be retained as official or state religions, with more or less of civil tolerance for Catholics. For the moment, the anti-papal party appears to be victorious, and no doubt believes that it is all over with the Catholic Church. That party had persuaded itself that the church, as a ruling body, was of imperial origin—that the papal power had been created by the edicts of Roman emperors, and that it depends entirely on the civil authority for its continuance. Hence they concluded that, if the church could be deprived of all civil support, it must fall. They said, the church depends on the papacy, and the papacy depends on the empire; hence, detach the empire—that is, the civil power—from the papacy, and the whole fabric tumbles at once into complete ruin. It is not improbable that, to confound them, to bring to naught the wisdom of the wise, and to take the crafty in their own craftiness, Providence has suffered them to succeed. He has permitted them to detach the empire, that they may see their error.

The successful party have reckoned without their host. They have reasoned from false premises, and come necessarily to false conclusions. The church is, undoubtedly, essentially papal as well as episcopal, and the destruction of the papacy would certainly be her destruction as the visible church; but it is false to assume that the papacy was created by imperial edicts and depends on the empire, for it is an indisputable historical fact that it existed prior to any imperial edict in its favor, and while the empire was as yet officially pagan, and hostile to the church. Hence it does not follow that detaching the empire from the papacy will prove its destruction. The church was as papal in its constitution when the whole force of the empire was turned against it, when it sought refuge in the catacombs, as it is now, or was in the time of Gregory VII. or Innocent III., and is as papal in this country, where it has no civil support

or recognition, as in Spain, or the Papal States themselves. The very principle, idea, and nature of the church, as we have set them forth in asserting the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order, of which she is the organ, contradict in the most positive manner the dependency of the papacy on the empire.

The church as a visible body has, no doubt, temporal relations, and therefore temporal interests susceptible of being affected by the changes which take place in states and empires, and it is not impossible, nor improbable, that the recent changes in Europe may more or less deeply affect those interests. The papacy has itself so judged, and has resisted them with all the means placed at its disposal. These changes, if carried out, if completed, will affect in a very serious manner the relations of the papacy with temporal sovereigns, or, to use the consecrated term, with the empire, and many of its regulations and provisions for the administration of ecclesiastical affairs will certainly need to be changed or modified, and much inconvenience during the transition to the new state of things will no doubt be experienced. All changes from an old established order, though in themselves changes for the better, are for a time attended with many inconveniences. The Israelites escaping from Egyptian bondage had to suffer weariness, hunger and thirst in the wilderness before reaching the promised land. But whatever temporal changes or inconveniences of this sort the church in her external relations may have to endure, they are accidental, and by no means involve her destruction, or impair her power or integrity as the church of God, or divinely instituted organ of the spiritual order.

There is no question that the party that regards itself as having triumphed in the success of Italy and Prussia is bitterly hostile not only to what it calls the papal politics, but to the Catholic Church herself, and will not be satisfied with simply detaching the empire from her support, but will insist on its using all its power and influence against her. That party, indeed, demands religious liberty, but religious liberty, in its sense of the term, is full freedom for all religions except the Catholic, the only true religion. Error, they hold, is harmless when reason is free, but truth they instinctively feel is dangerous to their views and wishes, and must for their safety be bound hand and foot. But suppose the worst; suppose the civil power becomes actively hostile to the church, prohibits by law the profession and

practice of the Catholic religion, punishes Catholics with fines and imprisonment, fire and sword, the dungeon and the stake, the church will be no worse off than she was under the pagan emperors, hardly worse off than she was under even the Arians. The empire under the Jew and the gentile exerted its utmost fury against her, and exerted it in vain. It found her irrepressible. The more she was opposed and persecuted, the more she flourished, and the blood of the martyrs fattened the soil for a rich growth of Catholics. Individuals and nations may be, as they have been, detached from her communion, and many souls for whom Christ died perish everlastingly, which is a fearful loss to them, and society may suffer the gains acquired to civilization during eighteen centuries to be lost, and moral and intellectual darkness gather anew for a time over the land, once enlightened by the Sun of righteousness, for God governs men as free moral agents, not as machines or slaves; but the church will survive her persecutors, and reconquer the empire for God and his Christ. Is she not founded on the Rock of Ages, and is it not said by him who is truth itself, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her?

It would be impossible to subject the church to a severer ordeal than she has time and again passed through, and it is not likely that her children will be exposed to greater trials than those to which they were subjected in the fifth and sixth centuries by the subversion of the Roman empire by the pagan and Arian barbarians, or to suffer heavier calamities than were inflicted on them by the so-called reformation in the sixteenth century. The Protestants of to-day cannot be fiercer, more intolerant or fanatical than they were in the age of Luther and Calvin; and the infidels of to-day cannot be more envenomed against the church, or more bloodthirsty and brutal, than were the infidels in the French revolution; and all these the church has survived.

The well-being of society, its orderly, peaceful, and continuous progress, requires, as the Holy See has constantly maintained, the coöperation and harmonious action of the church and the empire or republic, but the church has seldom found the empire ready and willing to coöperate with her, and the record of the struggles between her and it fills more than a brief chapter in ecclesiastical and civil history. In point of fact, the church has usually found herself embarrassed and oppressed by officially Catholic states, and most of the popular prejudices that still exist against her owe

their origin neither to her doctrines nor to her practices, but to the action of secular governments officially Catholic. In the last century, her bitterest enemies were the sovereigns of officially Catholic states; the most generous friends of the Holy See were states officially heretical or schismatic, as Russia, Great Britain, Sweden, and Prussia. Austria is humiliated and suffering now for being in the way of the anti-papal aggression, and every generous-hearted man sympathizes with her noble-minded and well-disposed if not able emperor, and it is no time to speak of her past shortcomings; but this much may be said, she has seldom been a generous supporter of the Holy See, and sometimes has been its oppressor.

Governments, like individuals, seldom profit by any experience but their own; yet experience has proved, over and over again, that governments the most powerful cannot, however determined on doing so, extirpate Catholicity by force from their dominions. Pagan Rome, once the haughty mistress of the world, tried it, made the profession of the Christian faith punishable with death, and death in the most frightful and excruciating forms, but failed. England, with all her power, with all her Protestant zeal, aided by her intense national prejudices, though she emulated the cruelties of the Cæsars and even surpassed the Cæsars in her craft and treachery, has never been able to extinguish the Catholic faith and love of the Irish people, the great majority of whom have never ceased to adhere to the Catholic religion. The church thrives under persecution, for to suffer for Christ's sake is a signal honor, and martyrdom is a crown of glory. The government can reach no further than to the bodies and goods of Catholics, and he who counts it an honor to suffer, a crown to die, for his faith, fears nothing that can be done to these, and is mightier than king or kaiser, parliament or congress. The Christians, as Lactantius well says, conquered the world not by slaying but by being slain. Woe to him who slays the Catholic for his religion, but immortal honor and glory to him who is slain! Men are so constituted that they rarely love that which costs them nothing, no sacrifice. It is having suffered for our native land that hallows it in our affections, and the more we suffer for the church the more and the more tenderly do we love her. St. Hilary accuses the Arian Constantius of being a worse enemy to the church than Nero, Decius, or Diocletian, for he seduced her prelates by favors, instead of enabling them to acquire glory in openly dying for the faith.

The civil power can never uproot Catholicity by slaying Catholics, or robbing the church of her temporalities. Impoverish the church as you will, you cannot make her poorer than she was in our Lord himself, who had not where to lay his head, nor than she was in the twelve apostles when they went forth from that "upper room" in Jerusalem to conquer the world. She has never depended upon the goods of this world as the means of accomplishing her mission, and her possessions have often been an embarrassment, and exposed her to the envy, cupidity, and rapacity of secular princes. If deprived by the revolution of the temporalities of her churches, and left destitute, so to speak, of house or home, she can still offer up "the clean oblation," as she has often done, in private houses, barns, groves, catacombs, caverns in the earth, or clefts in the rocks.

The church has frequently been deprived of her temporal possessions and of all temporal power, but the poor have suffered by it more than she. She is really stronger in France to-day than she was in the age of Louis XIV., and French society is, upon the whole, less corrupt than in the time of Francis I. Religion revives in Spain in proportion as the church loses her wealth. There are no countries where the church has been poorer than in Ireland and the United States, and none where her prosperity has been greater. Let matters, then, take the worst turn possible, Catholics have little to fear, the church nothing to apprehend, except the injury her enemies are sure to do themselves, which cannot fail to afflict her loving heart.

Yet, whatever may be the extent of the changes effected or going on in the states and empires of Europe, I apprehend no severe or prolonged persecution of Catholics. The church in this world is and always will be the church militant, because she is not of this world, and acts on principles not only above but opposed to those on which kings and kaisers and the men of this world act. She therefore necessarily comes in conflict with them, and could render them no service if she did not. Conflicts there will be, annoyances and vexations must be expected; but in all the European states as well as our own, if we except Sweden and Denmark, there is too large a Catholic population to be either massacred, exiled, or deprived of the rights of person and property common to all citizens or subjects. The British government has been forced to concede Catholic emancipation, and all appearances indicate that she will be

forced ere long to place Catholics in all respects on a footing of perfect equality with Protestants before the state. Prussia, should she, as is possible, absorb all Germany, will have nearly as many Catholic as Protestant subjects, and though she may insist on remaining officially Protestant and anti-Catholic, she will find it necessary to her own peace and security to allow her Catholic subjects to enjoy liberty of religion and equal civil rights. The mass of the Italian people are Catholics, and will remain Catholics; and these are not times when even absolute, much less constitutional, sovereigns can afford to disregard the rights, feelings and convictions of any considerable portion of their people.

The anti-papal party may prove strong enough to deprive the Holy Father of his temporal sovereignty and make Rome the capital of the new kingdom of Italy; that is undoubtedly laid down in the programme, and is only a natural, a logical result of Napoleon's campaign of 1859 against Austria, and Napoleon holds that the logic of events must be submitted to. He said in 1859 that there were two questions to be settled, the Italian question and the Roman question. As the former has been settled by expelling the Austrians from Italy, so the latter is likely to be settled by the deprivation of the pope as temporal sovereign—the plan of settlement being evidently to secure to the anti-papal party all it demands. Austria humiliated cannot interpose in behalf of the temporal sovereignty, and is reported to have abandoned it; Napoleon will not do it, unless compelled, for he has been the determined but politic enemy of that sovereignty ever since, with his elder brother, he engaged in a conspiracy, in 1831, to destroy the papal government; and Russia, Great Britain, and Prussia, all anti-Catholic states, will abandon the papal throne to the logic of events. Under the providence of God, it depends on the Italian people whether the Holy Father shall retain his temporal sovereignty or not, and what they will do nobody can say. They are capable of doing any thing hostile to the pope one moment, and the next of falling on their knees before him, and, with tears in their eyes, begging his absolution.

But beyond the rights of the supreme pontiff as sovereign of the Roman state, I do not apprehend any serious attacks on the papacy; or after the first fury has passed, even on ecclesiastical property. Much hostility for a time will be displayed, no doubt, against the monastic orders, and where they have any property remaining in their possession, it,

not unlikely, will be confiscated, and the right of the church to be a proprietor may be legally denied or not recognized, yet property dedicated to religious uses will be passably secure under the general law protecting citizens in their rights of property, to make gifts *inter vivos*, and testamentary bequests. The law will gradually become throughout Europe what it is with us. The civil law in the United States knows nothing of the canons of the church establishing religious orders, or of the vows taken by the religious; it takes no cognizance of the church herself, it recognizes in her no proprietary rights, and gives her no standing in the courts, and yet nowhere is ecclesiastical property better protected or more secure, and nowhere are religious orders more free in person or more secure in property. This proceeds from the right of property secured to the citizens, and the right of the church, and of religious orders, not as proprietors, but, if I may so speak, as recipiendaries, or their right to receive and enjoy eleemosynary gifts, grants, and bequests in whatever form made, which the courts protect according to the will of the donors or testators. There may be great inconveniences resulting from the inevitable changes taking place, and great wrong is pretty sure to be done. The church has a valid right to be a proprietor, and it is a great crime and a great sin to rob her of any of her possessions; but she can carry on, and in most countries long has carried on, her mission without the law recognizing in her any proprietary rights.

Present appearances indicate that the church throughout the world will be thrown back, as she was in the beginning, on her internal resources as a spiritual kingdom; that she will cease to be the official church of any nation—at least for a time, if not for ever; and that she will not henceforth govern or protect her children as civil communities, states, or empires through their civil rulers, but simply as Catholics, individual members of her communion, through her own spiritual ministry, her bishops and prelates alone, without any official relation with the state. She can even then exercise her full spiritual authority over her own members, as the independent kingdom of God on earth, free from all entangling alliances with the shifting politics of nations.

It is not assumed that the changes recent events have produced, or are producing, were desirable, are not evil, or are not brought about by evil passions, and from motives which every lover of truth and right does and must con-

demn; all that is argued is, that the church can survive them, and with less detriment to her material interests than her enemies have contemplated. Nothing that has taken place is defended, or defensible; but who can say that God in his gracious providence will not overrule all to the glory of his church and the good of them that love him? Who knows but he has given the victory to his enemies for the very purpose of confounding them, and showing them how vain are all their strivings against him and the order he has established? That very victory, seemingly so adverse and so afflicting to the Catholic heart, may prove to be the means of emancipating the church from her thraldom to the secular powers officially Catholic, but really anti-Catholic in spirit, and of preparing the way for her to labor more effectually than ever for the advancement of truth, the progress of civilization, and the salvation of souls. It is the prerogative of God to overrule evil for good, and the church, though immovable in her foundation, inflexible in her principles, and unchanging in her doctrines, has a wonderful capacity of adapting herself to all stages of civilization, and to all the changes in states and empires that may take place; she is confined within no national boundaries, and wedded to no particular form of civil government—she can subsist and carry on her work under Russian autocracy or American democracy, with the untutored savage and the most highly cultivated European, and is equally at her ease with the high and the low, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and the poor, the bond and the free. The events which, to all human judgment, seem adverse often turn out to be altogether in our favor. "All these things are against me," said the patriarch Jacob, when required to send his son Benjamin down to Egypt, and yet the event proved that they were all for him. When the Jews with wicked hands took our Lord and slew him, crucified him between two thieves, they, no doubt, thought that they had succeeded, and that it was all over with him and his work; but what they did was a means to the end he sought, for it was only in dying that he could accomplish the work he came to do.

The detachment of the empire from the church, which has been effected for purposes hostile to her, and with the hope of causing her destruction, perhaps will prove to her enemies that she does not rest on the state, that the state is far more in need of her than she of it, and show in a clear and unmistakable light her independence of all civil sup-

port, her inexhaustible internal resources, her supernatural energy and divine persistence. The empire detached from her and abandoning her to herself, or turning its force against her, will cease to incumber her with its official help, will no longer stand as an opaque substance between her and the people, intercepting her light, and preventing them from beholding her in her spiritual beauty and splendor. The change will allay much political hostility, remove most of the political prejudices against her, and permit the hearts of the people to turn once more towards her as their true mother and best friend. It may in fact tend to revive faith, and prepare the nations to reunite under her divine banner. Be this as it may, every Catholic knows that she is in herself independent of all the revolutions of states and empires, of all the changes of this world, and feels sure that she is imperishable, and that in some way the victories of her enemies will turn out to be their defeat, and the occasion of new triumphs for her.

HISTORICAL LIBRARY OF THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PITTSBURG, PA.

THE CHURCH AND MONARCHY.

[From the Catholic World for February, 1867.]

Mr. Bancroft, the learned and philosophical historian of the United States, in one of his volumes devoted to the history of the American revolution, makes the remark that "Catholics are in general inclined to monarchy, and Protestants to republicanism." This is a very common opinion with non-Catholic American writers, and a large portion of the American people honestly fear that the rapid spread of Catholicity in this country is pregnant with danger to our republican institutions. Dr. England, late bishop of Charleston, one of the most illustrious Catholic prelates the country has ever had, maintained, on the contrary, with great earnestness and force, that the church does not favor monarchy, but does favor republicanism. What is the fact in the case? The question is not doctrinal, but historical, and relates to Catholics and Protestants, rather than to the church and Protestantism.

It should be observed, before entering into any investigation of the historical facts in the case, that in the Catholic mind theology is superior to politics; and no intelligent Catholic ever consents or can consent to have his religion tried by a political standard. The church, the Catholic holds, represents what is supreme, eternal, universal, and immutable in human affairs, and that political principle or system which conflicts with her, is by that fact alone condemned as false; for it conflicts with the eternal, universal, and immutable principles of the divine government, or the truth and constitution of things. Religion is for every one who believes in any religion at all the supreme law, and in case of conflict between religion and politics, politics, not religion, must give way.

Well grounded in his faith, sure of his church, the Catholic has never any dread of historical facts, and can always, so far as his religion is concerned, enter upon historical investigations with perfect freedom and impartiality of mind. He has no fear of consequences. Let the historical fact turn out as it may, it can never warrant any conclusions unfavorable to his religion. If the fact should place his politics in conflict with his religion, he knows they are so far untenable, and that he must modify or change them. The historian of the United States is deeply penetrated with a sense of the independence and supremacy of moral or spiritual truth, and with a justice rare in non-Catholic writers, attributes much of the corruption of French society in the last century to the subjection of the church to the state. Most non-Catholic writers, however, consider what is called Gallicanism as far more favorable to society than what they call ultramontanism; and in doing so, prove that they really, consciously or unconsciously, assume the supremacy of the political order, not of the religious. But in this they grossly err, and make the greater yield to the less; for not only is religion in the nature of things superior to politics, but one is always more certain of the truth of his religion than he is or can be of the wisdom and soundness of his politics.

The church teaches the divine system of the universe, asserts and maintains the great catholic principles from which proceeds all life, whether religious or political, and without which there can be neither church nor state; but it is well known that she prescribes no particular constitution of the state or form of civil government, for no particular constitution or form is or can be catholic, or adapted

alike to the wants and interests of all nations. Whatever is catholic in politics, that is, universally true and obligatory, is included in theology; what is particular, special, temporary, or variable, the church leaves to each political community to determine and manage for itself according to its own wisdom and prudence.

Every statesman worthy at all of the name knows that the same form of government is not fitted alike to the wants and interests of all nations, nor even of the same nation through all possible stages of its existence; and hence there is and can be no catholic form of government, and therefore the church, as catholic, can enjoin no particular form as universally obligatory upon Catholics. Were she to do so she would attempt to make the particular universal, and thus war against the truth and the real constitution of things, and belie her own catholicity. The principles of government, of all government, are catholic, and lie in the moral or spiritual order, as do all real principles. These the church teaches and insists on always and everywhere with all her divine authority and energy; but their practical application, saving the principles themselves, she leaves to the wisdom and prudence of each political community. The principles being universal, eternal, and unalterable, are within the province of the Catholic theologian; the practical application of the principles, which varies, and must vary, according to time and place, according to the special wants and interests of each political community, are within the province of the statesman.

Such being the law in the case, it is evident that the church does and can prescribe no particular form of civil government, and Catholics are free to be monarchists, aristocrats, or democrats, according to their own judgment as statesmen. They are as free to differ among themselves as to forms of government as other men are, and do differ more or less among themselves, without thereby ceasing to be sound Catholics. Mr. Bancroft, however, does not even pretend that the church requires her children to be monarchists, and he more than once insinuates that her principles, as Bishop England maintains, tend to republicanism, the contrary of what is done by most non-Catholic writers.

To determine what is the fact we must define our terms. *Monarchy* and *republic* are terms often vaguely and loosely used. All governments that have at their head a king or emperor are usually called, by even respectable writers,

monarchies, and those that have not are usually called republics, whether democratic like ancient Athens, aristocratic like Venice prior to her suppression by General Bonaparte, or representative like the United States. But this distinction is not philosophical or exact. All governments, properly speaking, in which the sovereignty is held to vest in the people or political community, and the king or emperor holds from the community and represents the majesty of the state, are republican, as was imperial Rome or is imperial France; all governments, on the other hand, in which the sovereignty vests not in the political community, but in the individual and is held as a personal right, or as a private estate, are in principle monarchical. This is, in reality, the radical distinction between republicanism and monarchy, and between civilization and barbarism, and it is so the terms should be understood.

The key to modern history is the struggle between these two political systems, or between Roman civilization and German barbarism, and subsequently to Charlemagne, more especially between feudalism and Roman imperialism. In this struggle the sympathies and influence of the church have been on the side against barbarism and feudalism, and in favor of the Roman system, and therefore on the side of republicanism. Rome, theoretically and in name, remained a republic under the emperors from Augustus to Augustulus. However arbitrary or despotic some of the Cæsars may have been and certainly were in practice, in principle they were elective, and held their power from the political community. The army had always the faculty of bestowing the military title of imperator or emperor, and all the powers aggregated to it, as the tribunitial, the pontifical, the consular, &c., were expressly conferred on Augustus by the senate and people of Rome. The sovereignty vested in the political community, never in the person of the emperor. The emperor represented the state, but never was himself the state. In principle Roman imperialism was republican, not in the strict or absolute sense monarchical at all.

The barbarian system brought from the forests of Germany was in its principle wholly different. Under it power was a personal right, and not, as under Roman imperialism, a trust from the community. With the barbarians there were tribes, nations, confederacies, but no commonwealth, no republic, no civil community, no political people, no

state. Republic, *res publica*, Scipio says in the *De Republica* of Cicero, cited by St. Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei*, means *res populi;* and he adds, that by people is to be understood not every association of the multitude, but a legal association for the common weal. *Non omnem cœtum multitudinis, sed cœtum juris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatum esse determinat.** In this sense there was no people, no *res populi*, or affairs of the people, under the barbarian system, nor even under the feudal system to which, with some Roman ideas, it gave birth after Charlemagne. Absolute monarchy, which alone is properly monarchy, according to Bishop England, did not exist among the barbarians in its full development; but it existed in germ, for its germ is in the barbarian chieftainship, in the fact that with the barbarians power is personal, not political, a right or privilege, not a trust, and every feudal noble developed is an absolute monarch.

These two systems after the conquest occupied the same soil. What remained of the old Roman population continued, except in politics, to be governed by the Roman law, *lex Romanorum*, and the barbarians by the *lex barbarorum*, or their own laws and usages. But as much as they despised the conquered race, the barbarians borrowed and assimilated many Roman ideas. The ministers of the barbarian kings or chiefs were for a long time either Romans or men trained in the Roman schools, for the barbarians had no schools of their own, and the old schools of the empire were at no time wholly broken up, and continued their old course of studies with greater or less success till superseded by modern universities. The story told us of finding a copy of the civil or Roman law at Amalfi, in the eleventh century, a fable in the sense commonly received, indicates that the distinction between barbarian and Roman in that century was beginning to be effaced, and that the Roman law, as digested or codified by the lawyers of Justinian, was beginning to become the common law in the West, as it long had been in the East, and still is in all the western nations formed within the limits of the old Roman empire, unless England be an exception. There was commenced, even before the downfall of Rome, a process of assimilation of Roman ideas and manners by the barbarians, which went on with greater force and rapidity in proportion as the barba-

* *De Civit. Dei*, lib. ii, cap. xxi.

rians were brought into the communion of the church. This process is still going on, and has gone furthest in France and our own country.

The barbarian chiefs sought to unite in themselves all the powers that had been aggregated to the Roman emperor, and to hold them not from the political community, but in their own personal right, which, had they succeeded, would have made them monarchs in the full and absolute sense of the term. Charlemagne tried to revive and reëstablish Roman imperialism, but his attempt was premature; the populations of the empire were in his time not sufficiently romanized to enable him to succeed. He failed, and his failure resulted in the establishment of feudalism—the chief elements of which were brought from Germany. The Roman element, through the influence of the church and the old population of the empire, had from the close of the fifth century to the opening of the ninth acquired great strength, but not enough to become predominant. The Germanic or barbarian elements, reënforced as they were by the barbarians outside of both the church and the empire, were too strong for it, and the empire of Charlemagne was hardly formed before it fell to pieces. But barbarism did not remain alone in feudalism, and Roman principles, to some extent, were incorporated into feudal Europe, and the Roman law was applied, wherever it could be, to the tenure of power, its rights and obligations; to the regulation, forfeiture, and transmission of fiefs, and to the administration of justice between man and man, as we apply the common law in our own country. But the constitution of the feudal society was essentially anti-Roman and at war with the principles of the civil or Roman law. Hence commenced a struggle between the feudal law and the civil—feudalism seeking to retain its social organization based on distinctions of class, privileges, and corporations; and the civil law, based on the principle of the equality of all men by the natural law, seeking to eliminate the feudal elements from society, and to restore the Roman constitution, which makes power a trust derived from the community, instead of a personal right or privilege held independently of the community.

In this struggle the church has always sympathized with the romanizing tendencies. It was under the patronage of the pope that Charlemagne sought to revive imperial Rome, and to reëstablish in substance the Roman constitution of

society; but his generous efforts ended only in the systematization and confirmation of feudalism. The Franconian and especially the Suabian emperors attempted to renew the work of Charlemagne, but were opposed and defeated by the church, not because she had any sympathy with feudalism, but because these emperors undertook to unite with the civil and military powers held by the Roman emperors the pontifical power, which before the conversion of the empire they also held. This she could not tolerate, for by the Christian law the imperial power and the pontifical are separated, and the temporal authority, as such, has no competency in spirituals. The popes, in their long and severe struggles with the German emperors, or emperors of the holy Roman empire, as they styled themselves, did not struggle to preserve feudalism, but the independence of the church, threatened by the imperial assumption of the pontifical authority held by the emperors of pagan Rome. This is the real meaning of those struggles which have been so strangely misapprehended, and so grossly misrepresented by the majority of historians, as Voigt and Leo, both Protestants, have conclusively shown. St. Gregory VII., who is the best representative of the church in that long war, did not struggle to establish a theocracy, as so many foolishly repeat, nor to obtain for the church or clergy a single particle of civil power, but to maintain the spiritual independence of the church, or her independent and supreme authority over all her children in things spiritual, against the emperor, who claimed, indirectly at least, supreme authority in spirituals as well as in temporals. For the same reason Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. opposed Frederic II., the last and greatest of the Hohenstaufen, the ward in his childhood of Innocent III. Frederic undertook to revive Roman imperialism against mediæval feudalism, but unhappily he remembered that the pagan emperor was *pontifex maximus*, as well as imperator. Had he simply labored to substitute the Roman constitution of society for the feudal without seeking to subject the church to the empire, he might have been opposed by all those Catholics, whether lay or cleric, whose interests were identified with feudalism, but not by the church herself; at least nothing indicates that she would have opposed him, for her sympathies were not and have never been with the feudal constitution of society.

In the subsequent struggles between the two systems, the

church, as far as I have discovered, has uniformly sympathized with kings and kaisers only so far as they simply asserted the republican principles of the Roman constitution against feudalism, and has uniformly opposed them, whenever they claimed or attempted to exercise pontifical authority, or to make the temporal supreme over the spiritual, that is to say, to subject conscience to the state. But in this she has been on the side of liberty in its largest and truest sense. Liberty, as commonly understood, or as it enters into the life, the thought, and conscience of modern Christian nations, is certainly of Greek and Roman, not barbarian origin, enlarged and purified by Christianity. The pagan republic united in the sovereign people both the pontifical and imperial powers as they were in the pagan emperors, and hence subjected the individual, both exteriorly and interiorly, to the state, and left him no rights which he could assert before the republic. The Christian republic adds to the liberty of the state, the liberty of the individual, and so far restricts the power of the state over individuals. This personal or individual freedom, unknown in the Græco-Roman republic, Guizot and many others tell us was introduced by the German invaders of the Roman empire. They assign it a barbarian origin; but I am unable to agree with them, because I cannot find that the German barbarians ever had it. The barbarian, as the fendal, individual freedom was the freedom of the chief or noble, not the freedom of all men, or of all individuals irrespective of class or caste. This universal individual freedom, asserted and in a measure secured by the Christian republic, could not be a development of a barbarian idea, or come by way of logical deduction from the barbarian individual freedom, for it rests on a different basis, and is different in kind. The only ancient people with whom I can find any distinct traces of it are the Hebrew people. It is plainly asserted in the laws of Moses for the Jewish people. Christianity asserts it for all, both Jews and gentiles, in that noble maxim, We must obey God rather than men. Every martyr to the Christian faith asserted it, in choosing rather to be put to death in the most frightful and excruciating forms than to yield up the freedom of conscience at the command of the civil authority, and the church shows that she approves it by preserving the relics of martyrs, and proposing them to the perpetual veneration of the faithful. The martyr witnesses alike to faith and the freedom of conscience.

To this individual freedom, as the right of manhood, the real enemy is the feudal society, which is founded on privilege; and where then should the church be found but on the side of those who asserted Græco-Roman civilization as enlarged, purified, and invigorated by Christianity against the barbarian elements retained by the feudal society? It was her place as the friend of liberty and civilization. There can be no question that since the beginning of the fifteenth century the interests of humanity, liberty, religion, have been with the kings and people, as against the feudal nobility. It is owing to this fact, not to any partiality for monarchy, even in its representative sense, that the church has supported the monarchs in their struggle against feudal privileges and corporations.

But it is said that she has favored Roman imperialism not only against feudalism, but also against democracy. This is partially true, but she has done so for the very reason that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries she opposed the German emperors, because everywhere, except in the United States, it seeks to unite in the republic or state, after the manner of the pagan republic, both the imperial and the pontifical powers. In the United States this has not been done; our republic recognizes its own incompetency in spirituals, protects all religions not *contra bonos mores*, and establishes none; and here the church has never opposed republicanism or democracy. In Europe she has done so, not always, but generally since the French revolution assumed to itself pontifical authority. In the beginning of the French revolution, while it was confined to the correction of abuses, the redress of grievances, and the extension and confirmation of civil liberty, the pope, Pius VI., the cardinals, prelates, and people of Rome, encouraged it; and the pope censured it only when it transcended the civil order, made a new distribution of dioceses, enacted a civil constitution for the clergy, and sought to separate the Gallican church from the Catholic Church, precisely as the popes had previously censured Henry IV., Frederic Barbarossa, Frederic II., Louis of Bavaria, and others. She opposes today European democrats, not because they are democrats, but because they claim for the people the pontifical power, and seek to put them in the place of the church, nay in the place of God. The more advanced among them utter the words, people-pontiff and people-God, as well as people-king, and your German democrats assert almost to a man human-

ity as the supreme God. She opposes them not because they make deadly war on monarchy and aristocracy, and assert the sovereignty, under God, of the people, but because they war against catholic truth, the great eternal, universal, and immutable principles of the divine government, which lie at the basis of all government, and indeed of society itself, and of which she is the divinely appointed guardian in human affairs. If she supports the European governments against them, it is not because those governments are monarchical or aristocratic in their constitution, but because they represent, however imperfectly, the interests of humanity, social order, civilization, without which there is and can be no real progress. She cannot oppose them because they seek to establish democratic government, unless they seek to do so by unlawful or unjust means, because she prescribes for the faithful no particular form of civil government, and cannot do it, because no particular form is or can be catholic. She offers no opposition to American democracy.

The church opposes, by her principles, however, what is called absolutism, or what is commonly understood by oriental despotism, that is, monarchy as understood by Bishop England, under which the monarch is held to be the absolute owner of the soil and the people of the nation, and may dispose of either at his pleasure. This is evident from the fact that when she speaks officially of the state generally, without referring to any particular state, she calls it *respublica*, the republic; especially is this the case when she speaks of the civil society in distinction from the ecclesiastical society. Our present Holy Father, in his much misapprehended and grossly misrepresented encyclical of December 8, 1864, calls the civil community *respublica*, or commonwealth. St. Augustine denies that God has given to man the lordship of man. He gave man the lordship or dominion over irrational creatures, but not of the rational made in his own image, *Rationalem factum ad imaginem suam noluit nisi irrationabilibus dominari: non hominem homini, sed hominem pecori. Inde primi justi, pastores pecorum magis quam reges hominum constituti sunt.** Hence he denies that the master has the lordship of his servants or slaves, and admits slavery only as a punishment, as does the civil law itself. For the same reason we may conclude against despotism. If the master has not the abso-

**De Civit. Dei*, lib. xix, cap. xv.

lute lordship of his servants, far less can a king have the absolute lordship of a whole nation. St. Gregory the Great cites St. Augustine with approbation, so also, if my memory serves me, does St. Gregory VII., the famous Hildebrand, who tells the princes of his time that they hold their power from violence, wrong, Satan.

Catholic writers of the highest authority, St. Augustine, St. Thomas, Bellarmine, and Suarez, whom to cite is to cite nearly the whole body of Catholic theologians, follow in the main the political philosophy of Greece and Rome as set forth by Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero; and there is no doubt that, while vesting sovereignty in the community, or the people politically associated, they generally incline to monarchy, tempered by a mixture of aristocracy and democracy, as does Aristotle himself. But the monarchy they favor is always the representative monarchy, the Roman, not the feudal or the oriental. The prince or king, according to them, holds his power from the people or community, *jure humano*, not *jure divino*, and holds it as a trust, not as a personal and indefeasible right. It is amissible; the king may forfeit it, and be deprived of it. St. Augustine asserts, and Suarez after him, the inherent right of the people or political society to change their magistrates and even their form of government; and the popes, on more occasions than one in the middle ages, not only excommunicated princes, but declared them by a solemn judgment deprived of their crowns, which proves, if nothing else, that kings and kaisers are held by the church to be responsible to the nation for the manner in which they use their trusts, for the popes never declared a forfeiture except on the ground that it was incurred by a violation of the civil constitution.

There were numerous republics in Europe before the reformation, as Venice, Genoa, Florence, the Swiss cantons, and many others, not to speak of the Lombard municipalities, the Hansa towns, and the Flemish or Belgian communes, all of which sprang up during Catholic times, and were founded and sustained by a Catholic population. Nearly all of them have now disappeared, and some of them almost within our own memory; but I am not aware that there is a single republic in Europe founded and sustained by Protestants, unless the United Dutch Provinces, now a monarchical state, be a partial exception. The fact that Catholics as a body are wedded to monarchy is therefore not susceptible of very satisfactory proof, not even if we take mon-

archy only as representing the majesty of the people, in which sense it is republican in principle.

Protestantism is in itself negative, and neither favors nor disfavors any form of government; but the reformation resulted, wherever it prevailed in Europe, in uniting what the church from the first had struggled to keep separate, the pontifical and the imperial or royal powers, and also in maintaining the feudal monarchy instead of the Roman or representative monarchy. In every nation that accepted the reformation the feudal monarchy was retained, and still subsists. The crown in them all is an estate, as in England, and in some of them is, in fact, the only estate recognized by the constitution. The elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave of Brandenburg, the kings of Sweden, of Denmark, and of England and Scotland, became each in his own dominions supreme pontiff, and united in his own person the supreme civil and ecclesiastical powers. The same in principle became the fact in the Protestant Netherlands and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland; and though some Protestant European states tolerate dissent from the state religion, there is not one that recognizes the freedom of religion, or that does not subject religion to the civil power. The political sense of the reformation was therefore the union of the imperial and pontifical powers in the political sovereign, and the maintenance of the feudal monarchy and nobility, or the constitution of society on feudal principles. Nothing, then, is or can be further from the fact than that Protestants generally incline to republicanism, except the pretence that Protestantism emancipates the mind and establishes religious liberty.

No doubt, the feudal monarchy and nobility struggled in all Europe to maintain themselves against the Græco-Roman system represented by the civil law and favored by the theologians of the church and her supreme pontiffs. So far as the struggle was against the feudal nobility, or, as I may term it, the system of privilege, the church, the kings, and the people have in their general action been on the same side; and hence in France, where the struggle was the best defined, the great nobles were the first to embrace the reformation; they came very near detaching the kingdom itself from the church, during the wars of the Ligue, and were prevented only by the conversion, interested or sincere, of Henry IV. Henry saw clearly enough that monarchy could not struggle successfully in France against the

feudal nobility without the support of the church and the people. Richelieu and Mazarin saw the same, and destroyed what remained of the feudal nobility as a political power. They, no doubt, did it in the interest and for the time to the advantage of monarchy. Louis XIV. concentrated in himself all the powers of the state, and could say, *L'état, c'est moi*—I am the state, and tried hard to grasp the pontifical power, and to be able to say, *L'église, c'est moi*—I am the church; but failed. Always did and do kings and emperors, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, seek to enlarge their power and to gain to themselves the supreme control not only of civil but also of ecclesiastical affairs, and courtiers, whether lay or cleric, are always but too ready to sustain absolute monarchy. Warring against the system of privilege, for national unity against the disintegrating tendencies of feudalism, monarchy threatened in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to become absolute in all Europe, but it met with permanent success in no state that did not adopt the reformation, and cease to be Catholic.

I hold that the Roman constitution, as modified and amended by Christianity, is far better for society and more in accordance with religion and liberty, than the feudal constitution, which is essentially barbaric. If we look at Europe as it really was during the long struggle hardly yet ended, we shall see that it was impossible to break up the feudal constitution of society without for the moment giving to the kings an undue power, which in its turn would need to be resisted. But in all countries that remained Catholic, monarchy was always treated as representative by the theologians, and the republican doctrines that subsequent to the reformation found advocates in Protestant states were borrowed either from the ancients or from Catholic writers—for the most part, probably, from the mediæval monks, of whom modern liberals know so little and against whom they say so much. It was only in those countries where the reformation was followed and religion subjected to the state that the feudal monarchy developed into the oriental. England under Henry VIII., Edward VI., Elizabeth Tudor, and James and Charles Stuart, had lost nearly all its old liberties, and nearly all power was centred in the crown. The resistance offered to Charles I. was not to gain new but to recover old liberties, with some new and stronger guaranties. The Protestant princes of northern Germany governed as absolutely as any oriental despot.

The movement towards republicanism started in the South, not in the North, in Catholic not in Protestant states. The fact is patent and undeniable, explain it as you will.

I admit that Catholic princes as well as Protestant, sought to grasp the pontifical power, and to subject the church in their respective dominions to their own authority, but they never fully succeeded. The civil power claimed in France more than belonged to it; but while it impeded the free movements of the Gallican church, it never succeeded in absolutely enslaving it. Louis XIV., or even Napoleon I., never succeeded in making himself the head of the Gallican church; and the constitutional church created by the revolution, and which, like the church of England, was absolutely dependent on the civil power, has long since disappeared and left no trace behind. In Spain, Portugal, Naples, Tuscany, Austria, attempts to subject religion to the state have not been wanting, but, though doing great harm to both the ecclesiastical and the civil society, they have never been completely successful. It is only in Protestant states that they have fully succeeded, or rather, I should say, in non-Catholic states, for the church is as much a slave in Russia as in Great Britain.

Bossuet, courtier and high-toned monarchist as he was, and as much as he consented to yield to the king, never admitted the competency of the king in spirituals strictly so-called; and if he yielded to the king on the question of the regalia, it was only on the ground of an original concession from the head of the church to the kings of France, or the immemorial custom of the kingdom, not as an inherent right of the civil power. He went too far in the four articles of 1682 to meet the approbation of Innocent XI., but he did not fall into heresy or schism. And it may be allged in his defence, that if he had not gone thus far the court would most likely have gone further, and have actually separated the Gallican church from the Holy See.

Bossuet was unquestionably a monarchist and something of a courtier, though he appears to have had always the best interests of religion at heart; and we can hardly say that he did not take the best means possible in his time of promoting them. As one of the preceptors of the dauphin, father of the duke of Burgundy, of whom Fénelon was the principal preceptor, he taught the political system acceptable to the king; but he impressed on his pupil as much as possible under that system a sense of his responsibility,

his duty to regard his power as a high trust from God to be exercised without fear or favor for the good of the people committed to his charge. Fénelon went further, and hinted that the nation had not abdicated its original rights, and still retained the right to be consulted in the management of its affairs; and he was dismissed from his preceptorship, forbidden to appear at court, and exiled to his diocese, while every possible effort, in which it is to be regretted that Bossuet took a prominent part, to degrade him as a man and a theologian, and to procure his condemnation as a heretic, was made by the French court. But heretic he was not; he simply erred in the use of language which, though it had been used by canonized saints, was susceptible of an heretical sense. The congregation condemned the language, not the man, nor his real doctrine. He retracted the language, not the doctrine, and edified the world by his submission.

There is hardly any doctrine further removed from every form of republicanism than that of the divine right of kings, defended by James I. of England in his *Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings and the Independency of their Crowns*, written in reply to a speech of the celebrated Cardinal Duperron in the states-general of France in 1614—the last time the states-general were convoked till convoked by the unhappy Louis XVI. at Versailles, in May, 1789. In that work the king maintains that kings derive their kingship immediately from God, and are accountable to him alone for the use they make of their power. He denies their accountability alike to the pope and the people. This was and really is the doctrine, if not of all Protestants, at least of the Anglican church and of all Protestant courts; but it is not and never was a Catholic doctrine. The utmost length in the same direction that any other Catholic writer of note, except Bossuet, ever went, so far as I can find, is that the king, supposing him to be elected by the people, does, when so elected, reign, *de jure divino* or by divine right; but Suarez* refutes them, and maintains that the royal power emnates from the community, and is exercised, *formaliter*, by human right, *de jure humano*, and thus asserts the real republican principle. Balmes, in his great work on the *Influence of Catholicity and Protestantism on European Civilization compared*, cites an instance of a

* *De Legibus*, lib. iii., cap. 3, 4.

Spanish monk who in the time of Philip II. ventured one day to preach the irresponsibility of the king, but was compelled by the inquisition to retract his doctrine publicly, in the very pulpit from which he had preached it.

He who has studied somewhat profoundly the internal political history of the so-called Latin nations of Europe, will find that they have had, from very early times, a strong tendency to republicanism, and even to democracy, and that the tendency has been checked never by the church, but by the kings and feudal nobility. The doctrines of 1789 were no novelty in France even in the thirteenth century, and they were preached very distinctly and very boldly in the Ligue when the nation was threatened with a non-Catholic or Huguenot king, even by Jesuits. The great Dominican and Franciscan orders have never shown any strong attachment to monarchy in any form, and have rarely been the courtiers or flatterers of power. That the sad effects of the old French revolution produced a reaction in many Catholic minds, as well as in many Protestant minds, in favor of monarchy, is very true; and perhaps the most influential portion of European Catholics, living as they do in the midst of a revolution that makes war on the church, on civil order, on society, on civilization itself, cling to the royal authority as the less evil and as their only security, under God, for the future of religion. And it is not strange that they should. But this, whether wise or unwise, is only accidental, and no people will be more loyal republicans than Catholics, when the republic gives them security for life and property, and more than all, for the free and full exercise of their religion as Catholics, as is the case in the United States.

The republic of the United States, we are told, was founded by Protestants, and it is only the United States that can give the slightest coloring to the pretence that Protestants are inclined to republicanism. But, closely examined, the fact gives less coloring than is commonly supposed. The republic of the United States can hardly be said to be founded either by Catholics or Protestants: it was founded by Providence, not by men. The Puritans, the most disposed to republicanism of any of the original colonists, were dissenters from the Church of England, and the principles on which they dissented were in the main those which they had borrowed or inherited from Catholic tradition. They objected to the Church of England that

she allowed the king to be both king and pontiff, and subjected religion to the civil power. In this they only followed the example of the popes. They with the popes denied the competency of the civil power in spirituals. This was the principle of their dissent, as it has recently been the principle of the separation of the Free Kirk in Scotland from the national church. As the king was the head of the Church of England, making it a royal church, they were naturally led to defend their dissent on republican principles. M. Guizot seems to regard the English revolution, which made Cromwell Lord Protector of the realm, as primarily political; but with all due respect to so great an authority, I venture to say that it was primarily religious, that its first movement was a protest against the authority of the king or parliament to ordain any thing in religion not prescribed by the word of God. I state the principle universally, without taking notice of the matters accidentally associated with it, and so stated it is a Catholic principle, always asserted and insisted on by the popes. It was primarily to carry out this principle, and to regain the civil liberties lost by the nation through the reformation, but not forgotten, that they resisted the king, and made a republican revolution, which very few foresaw or desired. The Puritans who settled in the wilds of America brought with them the ideas and principles they had adopted before leaving England, and if they had republican tendencies, they were hardly republicans.

Mr. Bancroft, in Volume IX. of his History of the United States, just published, shows very clearly that at the beginning of their disputes with the mother country the colonists were not generally republican in the ordinary sense of the word, but attached to monarchy after the English fashion, and also that the struggle in the minds of the colonists was long and severe before they reluctantly abandoned monarchy and accepted republicanism. The American revolution did not originate in any desire to suppress monarchy as it existed in Great Britain and establish republicanism, but to resist the encroachments of the mother country on their rights as British colonists, or rather, as British subjects. The rights of man they asserted had been derived from the civil law, for the most part through the medium of the common law, and the writings, if not of Catholic theologians, at least of Catholic lawyers. They held as republicans not from Protestantism, but chiefly from

Greece and Rome. Moreover, a monarchical government was impracticable, and there really was no alternative for the American people but republican government or colonial dependence. In the main our institutions were the growth of the country, and were very little influenced by the political theories of the colonists or the political wisdom and sagacity of American statesmen. Hence they are more strictly the work of Providence than of human foresight or human intelligence and will. It is therefore that their permanence and growth are to be counted on. They have their root in the soil, and are adapted to both the soil and the climate. They are of American origin and growth.

Religious liberty is not, as I have shown, of Protestant origin. Most of the colonists held the Catholic principle of the incompetency of the civil power in spirituals, but the greater part of them held that the civil power is bound to recognize and to provide for the support by appropriate legislation of the true religion, and that only. Yet as they were not agreed among themselves as to which is the true religion, or what is the true sense of the revealed word, and having no authorative interpreter recognized as such by all, and no one sect being strong enough to establish itself and to suppress the others, there was no course practicable but to protect all religions not *contra bonos mores*, and leave each individual free before the law to choose his own religion and to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. This was of absolute necessity in our case if we were to form a political community and carry on civil government at all.

I do not claim that Catholics founded civil and religious liberty in the United States, nor do I deny that so far as men had a hand in founding them, they were founded by Protestants, but I do contend that our Protestant ancestors acted in regard to them on Catholic rather than on Protestant principles. We have so often heard civil and religious liberty spoken of as the result of the reformation that many people really believe it, and many good honest American citizens are really afraid that the rapid increase of Catholicity in the country threatens ruin to our free institutions. But the only liberty Protestantism, as such, has ever yet favored, is the liberty of the civil power to control the ecclesiastical. There is no danger to any other liberty from the spread of Catholicity. There is a great difference between accepting and sustaining a democratic government

where it already legally exists, and laboring to introduce it in opposition to the established order, and to the habits, customs, and usages of the people where it does not exist. And even if Catholics in other countries had a preference for the monarchical form, they would not dream of introducing it here, and would be led by their own conservative principles, if here, to oppose it, since nothing in their religion requires them, as a Catholic duty, to support one particular form of government rather than another.

Protestantism affords in its principles no basis for either civil or religious liberty. Its great doctrine, that which it opposes as a religion to the church, is the absolute moral and spiritual inability of man, or the total moral and spiritual depravity of human nature, by the fall. This is the central principle of the reformation, from which all its distinctive doctrines radiate. This doctrine denies all natural liberty and all natural virtues, and hence the reformation maintains justification without works, by faith alone, in which man is passive, not active, and that all the works of unbelievers or the unregenerate are sins. Man is impotent for good, and does not and cannot even by grace concur with grace. All his thoughts and deeds are only evil, and that continually, and even the regenerate continue to sin after regeneration as before, only God does not impute their sins to them, but for his dear Son's sake turns away his eyes from them, and imputes to them the righteousness of Christ, and with it covers their iniquities. There is no ground on which to assert the natural rights of man, for the fall has deprived man of all his natural rights; and for republican equality the reformation founds at best the aristocracy of grace, of the elect, as was taught by Wycliffe, and attempted to be realized by Calvin in Geneva, and by the Puritans in New England, who confined the elective franchise and eligibility to the saints, which is repugnant to both civil and religious liberty for all men.

It is time that our historians and popular writers should reflect a little on what they are saying, when they assert that the reformation emancipated the mind and prepared the way for civil and religious freedom. This has become a sort of cant, and Catholics hear it repeated so often that some of them almost think that it cannot be without some foundation, and therefore that there must be something uncatholic in civil and religious liberty. It is all a mistake, an illusion, or a delusion. The principles of the reforma-

tion, as far as principles it had, were and are in direct conflict with them, and whatever progress either has made has been not by it, but in spite of it, by means and influences it began its career by repudiating. The man reared in the bosom of the reformation has no conception of real religious, civil, or mental liberty till he is converted to the Catholic faith, and enters as a freeman into the Catholic Church.

I have dwelt at length on this subject for the sake of historical truth, and also to quiet the fears of my non-Catholic countrymen that the spread of the church in our country will endanger our republican or democratic system of government. That system of government is quite as acceptable to Catholics as it is to Protestants, and accords far better with Catholic principles than with the principles of the reformation. The church does not make our system of government obligatory on all nations; she directly enjoins it nowhere, because no one system is adapted alike to all nations; and each nation, under God, is free to adapt its political institutions to its own wants, taste, and genius; but she is satisfied with it here, and requires her children to be loyal to it. It is here the law, and as such I support it. I might not support a similar system for Great Britain, France, or Russia; because though it fits us, it might not fit equally well the British, the French, or the Russians, or as well as the systems they already have fit them. My coat may not fit my neighbor, and my neighbor's coat may not fit me. I am neither as a Catholic nor as a statesman a political propagandist. But I love my own country with an affection I was unconscious of as a Protestant, and Americans bred up Catholics will always be found to be among our most ardent patriots, and our most stanch defenders of both civil and religious freedom.

The mistake is that people are too ready to make a religion of their politics, and to seek to make the system of government they happen to be enamored of for themselves a universal system, and to look upon all nations that do not accept it, or are not blessed with it, as deprived of the advantages of civil society. They make their system the standard by which all institutions, all men and nations, are to be tried. They become political bigots, and will tolerate no political theories but their own. Hence the American people are apt to suppose there is no political freedom where our system of government does not prevail; and to conclude because the church recognizes the legitimacy of other forms

of governments in other countries, and does not preach a crusade against them, that she is the enemy of free institutions and social progress. All this is wrong. Religion is one and catholic, and obligatory upon all alike; political systems, save in the great ethical principles which underlie them, are particular, national, and are obligatory only on the nation that adopts them. There are catholic principles of government, but no catholic or universal form of government. Our government is best for us, but that does not prove that in political matters we are wiser or better than other civilized nations, or that we have the right to set ourselves up as the model nation of the world. Other nations may not be wholly forsaken by Providence. Non-Catholic Americans cry out against the church that she is anti-republican; but if we were monarchists we should cry out, as did the monarchical party in the sixteenth century, that she is anti-monarchical and hostile to the independence of kings. Let us learn that she may in one age or country support one form of civil constitution, and without inconsistency support a different system in another.

UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.*

[From the Catholic World for April, 1867.]

The political changes and weighty events that have occurred since, have almost obliterated from the memory the men and the revolutions or catastrophes of 1848 and 1849. We seem removed from them by centuries, and have lost all recollection of the great questions which then agitated the public mind, and on which seemed suspended the issues of the life and death of society. Then an irreligious liberalism threatened the destruction of all authority, of all belief in revelation, and piety towards God; and a rampant, and apparently victorious, socialism, or more properly, anti-socialism, threatened the destruction of society itself, and to

---

**Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism, considered in their fundamental Principles.* By Don Juan Donoso Cortés, Marquis of Valdegamas. Translated by Madeleine Vinton Goddard. Philadelphia: 1862.

replunge the civilized world into the barbarism from which the church, by long centuries of patient and unremitting toil, had been slowly recovering it.

Among the noble and brave men who then placed themselves on the side of religion and society, of faith and Christian civilization, and attempted to stay the advancing tide of infidelity and barbarism, few were more conspicuous, or did more to stir up men's minds and hearts to a sense of the danger, than the learned, earnest, and most eloquent Donoso Cortés, Marquis of Valdegamas. He was then in the prime and vigor of his manhood. Born and bred in Catholic Spain at a time when the philosophy of the eighteenth century had not yet ceased to be in vogue, and faith, if not extinct, was obscured and weak, he had grown up without religious fervor, a philosophist rather than a believer—a liberal in politics, and disposed to be a social reformer. He sustained the Cristinos against the Carlists, and rose to high favor with the court of Isabella Segunda. He was created a marquis, was appointed a senator, held various civil and diplomatic appointments, and was in 1848 one of the most prominent and influential statesmen in Spain, I might almost say, in Europe.

The death of a dearly beloved brother, some time before, had very deeply affected him, and became the occasion of awakening his dormant religious faith, and turning his attention to theological studies. His religious convictions became active and fruitful, and by the aid of divine grace vivified all his thoughts and actions, growing stronger and stronger, and more absorbing every day. He at length lived but for religion, and devoted his whole mind and soul to defend it against its enemies, to diffuse it in society, and to adorn it by his piety and deeds of charity, especially to the poor. He died in the habit of a Jesuit at Paris, in May, 1853.

Some of our readers must still remember the remarkable speech which the Marquis de Valdegamas pronounced in the Spanish cortes, January 4, 1849—a speech that produced a marked effect in France, and indeed throughout all Europe, not to add America—in which he renounced all liberal ideas and tendencies, denounced constitutionalism and parliamentary governments, and demanded the dictatorship. It had great effect in preparing even the friends of liberty, frightened by the excesses of the so-called liberals, red-republicans, socialists, and revolutionists, if not to favor, at least to

accept the *coup d'état*, and the reëstablishment of the imperial *régime* in France; and it, no doubt, helped to push the reaction that was about to commence against the revolutionary movements of 1848, to a dangerous extreme, and to favor, by another sort of reaction, that recrudescence of infidelity that has since followed throughout nearly all Europe. It is hardly less difficult to restrain reactionary movements within just limits than it is the movements that provoke them.

The *Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism* necessarily loses much in being translated, but Mrs. Goddard's translation comes as near to the original as any translation can. It is singularly faithful and elegant, and reproduces the thought and spirit of the author with felicity and exactness, in idiomatic English, which one can read without suspecting it to be not the language in which the work was originally written. There is scarcely a sentence in which the translation can be detected. It must have been made *con amore*, and we can recommend it as a model to translators, who too often do the work from the original language into no language.

The work shows no great familiarity with the writings of the later theologians, and no fondness for the style and method of the schools, but it shows a profound study of the fathers, and a perfect mastery of contemporary theories and speculations. The author is a man of the nineteenth century, with the profound thought of an Augustine, the eloquence of a Chrysostom, and the tender piety of a Francis of Assisi. He has studied the epistles of St. Paul, and been touched with the inspiration of that great apostle's burning zeal and consuming charity. He observes not always the technical exactness of modern theological professors, and some French *abbés* thought they detected in his *Ensayo* some grave theological errors, but only because they missed the signs which they were accustomed to identify with the things signified, and met with terms and illustrations with which they were unfamiliar. But he seizes with rare sagacity and firmness the living truth, and presents us theology as a thing of life and love.

The principles of the essay are catholic, are the real principles of Christianity and society, set forth with a clearness, a depth, a logical force, a truthfulness, a richness of illustration and an eloquence which have seldom, if ever, been surpassed. But some of the inferences he draws from them,

and some of the applications he makes of them to social and political science are not such as every Catholic even is prepared to accept. The author was drawn to religion by domestic afflictions, which saddened while they softened his heart, and he writes, as he felt, amid the ruins of a falling world. All things seemed to him gone or going, and he looked out upon a universal wreck. His spirit is not soured, but his feelings are tinged with the gloom of the prospect, and while he hopes in God he well-nigh despairs of the world, of man, of society, of civilization, above all, of liberty, and sees no means of saving European society but in the dictatorship or pure despotism acting under the inspiration and direction of the church. He was evidently more deeply impressed by what was lost in the primitive fall or original sin than by what in our nature has survived that catastrophe. He adored the justice of God displayed in the punishment of the wicked, justified him in all his dealings with men, but he saw in his providence no mercy for fallen nations, or a derelict society. This life he regarded as a trial, the earth as a scene of suffering, a vale of tears, and found in religion a support, indeed, but hardly a consolation. The Christian has hope in God, but is a man of sorrows, and his life an expiation. Much of this is true and scriptural, and this world certainly is not our abiding place, and can afford us no abiding joy. But this is not saying that there are no consolations, no abiding joys for us even in this life. Consolations and joys a Christian has in this world, though they proceed not from it. It can neither give them nor take them away; yet we taste them even while in it. This world is not the contradictory of the world to come; it is not heaven, indeed, and cannot be heaven, yet it is related to heaven as a medium, and the medium must partake, in some measure, of both the principle and the end.

The great merit of the essay is in deducing political and social from theological principles. This is undoubtedly not only the teaching of the church, but of all sound philosophy; and what I regard as the principal error of the book is the desire to transfer to the state the immobility and unchangeableness which belong to the church, an institution existing by the direct and immediate appointment of God. The author seems to be as unwilling to recognize the intervention of man and man's nature in government and society as in the direct and immediate works of the Creator. He is no pantheist or Jansenist, and yet he seems to me to make too

little account of the part of second causes, or the activity of creatures; and sometimes to forget, or almost to forget, that grace does not supersede nature, but supports it, strengthens it, elevates it, and completes it. He sees only the divine action in events; or in plain words, he does not make enough of nature, and does not sufficiently bring out the fact that natural and supernatural, nature and grace, reason and faith, earth and heaven, are not antagonistic forces, to be reconciled only by the suppression of the one or the other, but really parts of one dialectic whole, which, to the eye that can take in the whole in all its parts, and all the parts in the whole, in which they are integrated, would appear perfectly consistent with each other, living the same life in God, and directed by him to one and the same end. He, therefore, unconsciously and unintentionally, favors or appears to favor a dualism as unchristian as it is unphilosophical. God being in his essence dialectical, nothing proceeding from him can be sophistical, or wanting in logical unity, and one part of his works can never be opposed to another, or demand its suppression. The one must always be the complement of the other. Christianity was given to fulfil nature, not to destroy it. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."

The misapprehension on this subject arises from the ambiguity of the word *world*. This word is generally used by ascetic writers not to designate the natural order, but the principles, spirit, and conduct of those who live for this world alone; who look not beyond this life; who take the earth not as a medium, but as the end, and seek only the goods this world offers. These are called worldly, sensual, or carnal-minded people, and as such contrast with the spiritually minded, or those who look above and beyond merely sensible goods—to heaven beyond the earth, to a life beyond the grave, a life of spiritual bliss in indissoluble union with God, the end of their existence, and their supreme good as well as the supreme good in itself. In this sense there is a real antagonism between this world and the next; but when the world is taken in its proper place, and for what it really is, in the plan of the Creator, there is no antagonism in the case; and to despise it would be to despise the work of God, and to neglect it would be not a virtue, but even a sin. This world has its temptations and its snares, and as long as we remain in the flesh we are in danger of mistaking it for

the end of our existence, and therefore it is necessary that we be on our guard against its seductions. But the chief motive that leads souls hungering and thirsting for perfection to retire to the desert or the monastery is not that they may fly its temptations, or the enemies of their virtue, for they find greater temptations to struggle against and fiercer enemies to combat in solitude than in the thronged city; it is love of sacrifice, and the longing to take part with our Lord in his great work of expiation that moves them. Simply to get rid of the world, to turn the back on society, or to get away from the duties and cares of the world, is no proper motive for retirement from the world, and the church permits not her children to do it and enter a religious order so long as they have duties to their family or their country to perform. Nothing could better prove that the church does not suffer us to contemn or neglect the natural or temporal order, or regard as of slight importance the proper discharge of our duties to our families, our country, or natural society. The same thing is proved by the fact that the process for canonization cannot go on in a case where the individual has not fulfilled all his natural duties, growing out of his state or relations in society. *Gratia supponit naturam.*

In consequence of his tendency to an exclusive asceticism, a tendency which he owed to the unsettled times in which he lived, and the reaction of his own mind against the liberalism he had at one time favored, Donoso Cortés countenanced, to some extent, political absolutism; and had great influence in leading even eminent Catholics to denounce constitutionalism, legislative assemblies, publicity, and free political discussion, as if these things were uncatholic, and inseparable from the political atheism of the age. There was a moment when the writer of this article himself, under the charm of his eloquence, and the force of the arguments he drew from the individual and social crimes committed in the name of liberty and progress, was almost converted to his side of the question, and supported popular institutions only because they were the law in his own country. But without pretending that the church enjoins any particular form of civil policy, or maintaining the infallibility or impeccability of the people, either collectively or individually, a calmer study of history, and the recent experience of our own country, have restored me to my early faith in popular forms of government, or democracy as organized under our

American system, which, though it has its dangers and attendant evils, is, wherever practicable, the form of government that, upon the whole, best conforms to those great catholic principles on which the church herself is founded.

But the people cannot govern well, any more than kings or kaisers, unless trained to the exercise of power, and subjected to moral and religious discipline. It is precisely here that the work of Donoso Cortés has its value. The reaction which has for a century or two been going on against that mixture of civil and ecclesiastical government which grew up after the downfall of the Roman empire in the West, and which was not only natural but necessary, since the clergy had nearly all the learning, science, and cultivation of the times, and to which modern society is so deeply indebted for its civilization, has carried modern statesmen to an opposite extreme, and resulted in almost universal political atheism. The separation of church and state in our age means not merely the separation of the church and state as corporations or governments, which the popes have always insisted on, but the separation of political principles from theological principles, and the subjection of the church and ecclesiastical affairs to the state. Where monarchy, in its proper sense, obtains, the king or emperor, and where democracy, save in its American sense, is asserted, the people takes the place of God, at least in the political order. Statolatry is is almost as prevalent in our days as idolatry was with the ancient Greeks and Romans.

Even in our own country, it may be remarked that the general sympathy is with anti-Christian—especially anti-papal insurrections and revolutions. We should witness little sympathy with the Cretans and Christians of the Turkish empire, if they were not understood to be schismatics, who reject the authority of the pope in spirituals as well as in temporals. Yet, prior to the treaty of Paris in 1856, the Greek prelates were, under the Turkish sovereignty, the temporal lords of their people, and the design of that treaty, so far as relates to the eastern Christians, was to deprive them of the last remains of temporal independence, and to complete the conquest of Mahomet II. The complete subjection of religion to the state is called religious liberty, the emancipation of conscience. Our American press applauds the Italian ministry for laying down the law for the Italian bishops, restoring their sees, from which the state exiled them, and prescribing them their bounds, beyond which

they must not pass. The Italian state does not, as with us, recognize the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, but at best only tolerates it. It asserts not only the freedom and independence of the state in face of the church, but its supremacy, its right to govern the church, or at least to define the limits within which it may exist and operate.

This is what our age understands by the separation of church and state. If it foregoes, at any time or place, the authority to govern the church, it still holds that it has the right to govern churchmen the same as any other class of persons; that the civil law is the supreme law of the land; and that religion, when it happens to conflict with it, must give way to it. The law of the state is the supreme law. This is everywhere the doctrine of European liberals, and the doctrine they reduce to practice wherever they have the power, and hence the reason why the church visits them with her censures. Many devout believers think the separation of church and state must mean this, and can mean nothing else, and therefore that the union of church and state must mean a return to the old mixture of civil and ecclesiastical government of the middle ages. Hence a Donoso Cortés and a Baron Ricasoli are on this point in singular accord. Our American press, which takes its cue principally from European liberals, takes the same view, and understands both the separation and the union of church and state in the same sense.

Yet the American solution of the mutual relations of church and state is a living proof, a practical demonstration that they are wrong. Here the state does not tolerate the church, nor the church either enslave or tolerate the state, because the state recognizes the freedom of conscience, and its independence of all secular control. My church is my conscience, and my conscience being free here, my church is free, and for me and all Catholics, in the free exercise of her full spiritual authority. Here it is not the state that bounds conscience, but conscience that bounds the state. The state here is bound by its own constitution to respect and protect the rights of the citizen. Among these rights, the most precious is the right of conscience—the right to the free exercise of my religion. This right does not decide what the civil law shall be, but it does decide what it shall not be. Any law abridging my right of conscience—that is, the freedom of my church—is unconstitutional, and, so far, null and void. This, which is my right, is equally the

right of every other citizen, whether his conscience—that is, his church—agrees with mine or not. The Catholic and the Protestant stand on the same footing before the law, and the conscience of each is free before the state, and a limit beyond which the civil law cannot extend its jurisdiction. Here, then, is a separation of church and state that does not enslave the church, and a union of church and state that does not enslave the state, or interfere with its free and independent action in its own proper sphere. The church maintains her independence and her superiority as representing the spiritual order, for she governs those who are within, not those who are without, and the state acts in harmony, not in conflict with her, because it confines its action —where it has power—to things temporal.

The only restriction, on any side, is, that the citizen must so assert his own right of conscience as not to abridge the equal right of conscience in his fellow-citizen who differs from him. Of course the freedom of conscience cannot be made a pretext for disturbing the public peace, or outraging public decency, nor can it be suffered to be worn as a cloak to cover dissoluteness of manners or the transgression of the universal moral law ; when it is so made or worn it ceases to be the *right* of conscience, ceases to be conscience at all, and the state has authority to intervene and protect the public peace and public decency. It may, therefore, suppress the Mormon concubinage, and require the Latter Day Saints to conform to the marriage law as recognized by the whole civilized world, alike in the interests of religion and of civilization. But beyond this the state cannot go, at least with us.

It may be doubted whether this American system is practicable in any but a republican country—under a government based on equal rights, not on privilege, whether the privilege of the one, the few, or the many. Democracy, as Europeans understand it, is not based on equal rights, but is only the system of privilege, if I may so speak, expanded. It recognizes no equal rights, because it recognizes no rights of the individual at all before the state. It is the pagan republic which asserts the universal and absolute supremacy of the state. The American democracy is Christian, not pagan, and asserts, for every citizen, even the meanest, equal rights, which the state must treat as sacred and inviolable. It is because our system is based on equal rights, not on privilege—on rights held not from the state, but which

the state is bound to recognize and protect, that American democracy, instead of subjecting religion to the state, secures its freedom and independence.

Donoso Cortés can no more understand this than can the European democrat, because he has no conception of the equal rights of all men before the state; or rather, because he has no conception of the rights of man. Man, he says, has no rights; he has only duties. This is true, when we speak of man in relation to his Maker. The thing made has no right to say to the maker, "Why hast thou made me thus?" Man has only duties before God, because he owes to him all he is, has, or can do, and he finds beatitude in discharging his duties to God, because God is good, the good in itself, and would not be God and could not be creator if he were not. But that man has no rights in relation to society, to the state, or to his fellow man, is not true. Otherwise there could be no justice between man and man, between the individual and society, or the citizen and the state, and no injustice, for there is no injustice where no right is violated. Denying or misconceiving the rights of man, and conceiving the state as based on privilege, not on equal rights, the Spaniard is unable to conceive it possible to assert the freedom and independence of the state, without denying the freedom and independence of the church.

But, if republican institutions based on equal rights are necessary to secure the freedom and independence of the church, the freedom and independence of the church, on the other hand, are no less necessary to the maintenance of such institutions. I say, *of the church*, rather than of religion, because I choose to speak of things in the concrete rather than in the abstract, and because it is only as concreted in the church that the freedom and independence of religion can be assailed, or that religion has power to protect or give security to institutions based on equal rights. The church is concrete religion. Whether there is more than one church, or which of the thousand and one claimants is the true church, is not now the question. The answer of the Catholic is not doubtful. At present I am treating the question of equal rights, and asking no more for the church before the state than for the several sects. Of course, I recognize none of the sects as the church, but I am free to say that I regard even the lowest of them as better for society than any form of downright infidelity. There is something in

common between Catholics and the sects that confess Christ as the Son of God, incarnate for our redemption and salvation, which there is not, and cannot be, between us and those who confess not Christ at all. But this is a digression.

Equal rights must have a foundation, something on which to stand. They cannot stand on the state or civil society, for that would deny them to be rights at all, and reduce them to simple privileges granted by the state and revocable at its will. This is precisely the error of the European liberals, who invariably confound right with privilege. All European society has been, and still is to a great extent, based on privilege, not right. Thus in England you have the rights—more properly, the privileges or franchises—of Englishmen, but no rights of man which parliament is bound to recognize and protect as much. There is no right or freedom of conscience which the state must respect as sacred and inviolable; there is only toleration, more or less general. In the new kingdom of Italy there are the privileges and franchises of Italians, and, within certain limits, toleration for the church. Her bishops may exercise their spiritual functions so long as they do not incur the displeasure of the state. The supremacy of the state is asserted, and the ecclesiastical administration is at the mercy of the civil. It is so in every European state, because in none of them is the state based on equal rights. The United States are the only state in the world that is so based. Our political system is based on right, not privilege, and the equal rights of all men.

The state with us rests on equal rights of all men; but on what do the equal rights themselves rest? What supports or upholds them? The state covers or represents the whole temporal order, and they, therefore, have not, and cannot have, their basis or support in that order. Besides the temporal there is no order but the spiritual, covered or represented by the church. The equal rights, then, which are with us the basis of the state, depend themselves on the church or spiritual order for their support. Take away that order or remove the church, or even suppress the freedom and independence of the church, and you leave them without any support at all. The absolutism of the state follows, then, as a necessary consequence, and might usurps the place of right. Hence political principles must find their support in theology, and the separation of church and state in the sense of separating political from theologi-

al principles is as hostile to the state as to the church, and to liberty as to religion. It is not easy to controvert this conclusion, if we consider whence our rights are derived, and on what they depend for their reality and support.

These rights, which we do not derive from the state or civil society, and hold independently of it, among which the Declaration of Independence enumerates "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," which it asserts to be "inalienable," whence do we hold them but from God, our Creator? This is what is meant when they are called the natural rights of man. They are called natural rights, because rights held under the natural law, but the natural law in the sense of the jurists and theologians, not in the sense of the physicists or natural philosophers—a moral law addressed to reason and free-will, and binding upon all men, whatever their state or position; not a physical law, like that by which clouds are formed, seeds germinated, or heavy bodies tend to the centre of the earth; for it is a law that does not execute itself, and is not executed at all without the action of the reason and will of society. It is necessarily a law prescribed by the Author of nature, and is called the natural law, the law of natural justice, or the moral law, in distinction from the revealed or supernatural law, because promulgated by the supreme lawgiver through natural reason, or the reason common to all men, which is itself in intimate relation with the divine reason.

These natural equal rights are the law for the state or civil authority, and every law of the state that violates them violates natural justice, and is by that fact null and void; is, as St. Augustine says, and St. Thomas after him, "violence rather than law," and can never be binding on the civil courts, though human courts not unfrequently enforce such laws. Not being derived from the state or civil society, these rights are evidently not in the temporal order, or the same order with the state, and therefore must have, as we have seen, their basis in the spiritual order, that is, in theology, or have no basis at all.

The existence of God as the creator and upholder of nature, I do not here undertake to prove. I am not arguing against atheism in general, but only against what is called political atheism, or the doctrine that theology, and therefore the church, has nothing to do with politics. The state, with us, is based on the equal rights, not equal privileges, of all men; and if these equal rights have no real and solid

basis beyond and independent of civil society, the state itself has no real basis, and is a *château en Espagne*, or a mere castle in the air. Hence political atheism is not only the exclusion of the church from politics, but the denial of the state itself, and the substitution for it of mere physical force. Political atheism cannot be asserted without atheism in general, without, in fact, denying all existence, and, therefore, of necessity, all right. Political atheism is, then, alike destructive of religion and politics, church and state, of authority and liberty. Deny all right independent of the state, and the citizen can have no right not derived from the state, which denies all liberty; deny all right independent of the state, the state itself can have no right to govern, unless the state itself be God, which would be statolatry, alike absurd and blasphemous.

The rights of the state and of the citizen, alike must be derived from God, and have a theological basis, or be no rights at all, but words without meaning. There is then no such separation between politics and theology as European democracy asserts. Such separation is unphilosophical, and against the truth of things. It has been so held in all ages and nations of the world. All the great theologians, philosophers, and moralists of the human race have always held politics to be a branch of ethics, or morals, and that branch which treats of the application of the catholic principles of theology to society, or the social relations of mankind. The permanent, universal, and invariable principles of civil society are all theological principles, for there are no such principles outside of theology, and the office of the state is to apply these principles only to what is local, temporal, and variable. It is evident then that principles, properly so called, lie in the theological order, and come within the province of the theologian, not of the statesman, and are therefore to be determined by the spiritual society, not by the civil.

It is, then, the spiritual not the temporal, religion not politics, that asserts and maintains these rights, and religion does it in asserting and maintaining the right of conscience, which is the right of God, and the basis of all rights. The right of conscience is exemption from all merely human authority—a right to be held by all civil society as sacred and inviolable; and is the first and impassable barrier to the power of the state. The state cannot pass it without violence, without the most outrageous tyranny. It is then religion,

not the state, that asserts and maintains freedom; for the state when it acts, acts as authority, not as liberty. So, on the other hand, it is religion that asserts and maintains the authority, I say, not the force, of the state. The authority of the state is its right to govern. In respect to civil society itself, it is liberty; in respect to citizens, it is authority. Being a right on the part of the state or society, it, like all other rights, lies in the spiritual order, and is equally sacred and inviolable. Religion, then, while it makes it the duty of the state to recognize and protect the rights of the individual citizen, makes it the duty of the individual citizen to recognize, respect, and defend the rights of the state or society. The duty in both cases is a religious duty, because all right is held from God, and only God can enjoin duty, or bind conscience. Deny God, and you deny religion; deny religion, and you deny all duty and all right;—alike the rights and duties of the state and the rights and duties of the individual citizen, and, therefore, alike both liberty and authority, which being correlatives can never exist the one without the other. There is no denying this conclusion without denying reason itself.

But religion as an abstract theory, is powerless, as are all abstractions, and exists only as concreted, and religion in the concrete is the church. In the state and in the individual, God operates indeed, but mediately, through natural or secondary causes; but in the church immediately, for the church is his body, and her vitality is the Holy Ghost, who dwells in her, and is to her something like what the soul is to the body, *forma corporis*. Religion without the church is a theory or a vague sentiment; religion concreted in the church is a living reality, a power, and is efficient in vindicating both rights and duties, and affording a solid support to both liberty and authority. The sects, as far as they go, are concrete religion, but not religion in its unity and integrity. They are better than nothing; but lacking the unity and catholicity of truth, and being divided and subdivided among themselves, they can very imperfectly perform the office of religion or the Catholic Church. They are unable to make head against material force, and to maintain with any efficiency the rights of the spiritual against the encroachments of the temporal, or to prevent the state from asserting its own absolute supremacy. They exist not by a recognized right, but by state tolerance; they are suffered to exist and are protected, because they become

auxiliaries of the state in its efforts to break the power and influence of the church, whose authority in spirituals is more repugnant to them than is state supremacy. Hence we find that wherever, except in the United States, the spiritual power is broken and divided into a great variety of sects, the state claims to be supreme alike in spirituals and temporals; and it is very doubtful if the freedom and independence of the spiritual order could long be preserved even in our country should our sectarian divisions continue. These divisions are already generating a wide-spread indifference to religion, almost a contempt for it; while there are manifest and growing tendencies to extend the authority of the state beyond its legitimate bounds into the domain of individual liberty. The unity and catholicity of the church, representing the unity and catholicity of the spiritual order, will soon be seen to be necessary to preserve our free institutions.

It was concrete religion, in its unity and catholicity embodied in the church as an institution, that was able during the middle ages to assert the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, which is only another term for the freedom and independence of conscience, against the political order. She was thus constituted a living reality, a concrete power, and the powers of the earth had to reckon with her. Constituted as society then was, she needed and exercised more positive power in the temporal order than was agreeable to her, or than is necessary in a society constituted like ours. The republic, then, was pagan, and sought to be supreme everywhere and in every thing, or in other words, to subject the spiritual order to the temporal, as it was in pagan Rome, and for the most part continued to be even in Christian Rome of the East, till its conquest by the Turks. Hence the relation between Peter and Cæsar, between the pope and emperor, was ordinarily that of antagonism. It was necessary that the pope should be clothed with a power that could control princes, and force them to respect the rights of conscience, or the independence of the church, which to be sufficient must be positive as well as negative. The temporal authority, or the authority of the church over the temporal, claimed and exercised over secular princes seeking to combine in themselves both the imperial and the pontifical powers, was no usurpation, and rested on no grant of civil society, or *jus publicum*, as has sometimes been asserted, but grew out of the necessity of the case; its justi

fication was in its necessity to maintain her own independence in spirituals, or the freedom of conscience. It was her right as representing the spiritual order, and would be her right still in a similarly constituted society, and the modern world is reaping in its advanced civilization the fruits of her having claimed and exercised it.

The necessity for claiming and exercising that power in a society constituted as is the American does not exist, because in our society the state frankly concedes all that she was in those ages struggling for. There was nothing which Gregory VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., and other great popes struggled for against the German emperors, the kings of France, Aragon, and England, and the Italian republics, that is not recognized here by our republic to be the right of the spiritual order. Here the old antagonism between church and state does not exist. There is here a certain antagonism, no doubt, between the church and the sects, but none between the church and the state or civil society. Here the church has, so far as civil society is concerned, all that she has ever claimed, all that she has ever struggled for. Here she is perfectly free. She summons her prelates to meet in council when she pleases, and promulgates her decrees for the spiritual government of her children without leave asked or obtained. The *placet* of the civil power is not needed, is neither solicited nor accepted. She erects and fills sees as she judges proper, founds and conducts schools, colleges, and seminaries in her own way, without let or hindrance; she manages her own temporalities, not by virtue of a grant or concession of the state, but as her acknowledged right, held as the right of conscience, independently of the state. Here she has nothing to conquer from the state, for the civil law affords her the same protection for her property that it does to the citizen for his; and therefore all that she can seek in relation to the constitution of our civil society, is that it should remain unaltered.

True, the sects have before civil society the same freedom that she has, but the state protects her from any violence they might be disposed to offer her. They are not permitted to rob her of her churches, desecrate her altars, molest her worship, or interfere with her management of her own affairs. Their freedom in no respect whatever abridges hers, and whatever controversy she may have with them, it is entirely on questions with which civil society has nothing

to do, which are wholly within the spiritual order, and which could not be settled by physical force, if she had it at her command, and was disposed to use it. Lying in the spiritual order, they are independent of the state, and it has no right to interfere with them. There is nothing, then, in the freedom of the sects to interfere with the fullest liberty of the church, so long as the state recognizes and protects her freedom and independence as well as theirs. There is nothing, then, that the church can receive from civil society, that she has not in the United States, and guarantied to her by the whole force of the civil constitution.

It is one of the mysteries of Providence that what the popes for ages struggled for and still struggle for in the Old World, and in all parts of the New World originally colonized by Catholic states, should for the first time in history be fully realized in a society founded by the most anti-papal people on earth, who held the church to be the Scarlet Lady of the Apocalypse. Surely, they builded better than they knew. But explain it as you will, such is the fact. The United States is the only country in the world where the church is really free. It would seem that both state and church had to emigrate to the New World to escape the antagonisms of the Old, and to find a field for the free and untrammelled development of each. It is idle to fear that the church will ever seek to disturb the order established here, for she supports no principle and has no interest that would lead her to do it. Individual Catholics, affected by the relations that have subsisted between church and state in the Old World, and not aware that the church has here all that she has ever struggled for against kings and princes, may think that the church lacks here some advantages which she ought to have, or may think it desirable to reproduce here the order of things which they have been accustomed to elsewhere, and which in fact the church has submitted to as the best she could get, but has never fully approved. These, however, are few, and are soon corrected by experience, soon convinced that the real solution of the questions which have so long and often so fearfully agitated the nations of Europe, has been providentially obtained by the American people. The church has no wish to alter the relation that exists with us between her and the state.

But there is a very important question for the American people to ask themselves. With the multiplicity of sects,

the growing indifference to religion, and the political atheism consciously or unconsciously fostered by a large portion of the secular press and but feebly resisted by the religious press, will they be able to preserve the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, or protect the equal rights on which our political institutions are founded? Instead of asking, as some do, are the presence and extension of the church dangerous to our institutions, should they not rather ask, is she not necessary to their safety? The higher question to be addressed to the sects undoubtedly is, can men save their souls without the church? but in addressing politicians and patriots, it is not beneath the Catholic even to ask if the republic, the authority of the state, and the liberty of the citizen, both of which rest on the freedom and authority of conscience, can be saved or preserved without her? Are not the unity and catholicity which she asserts and represents, and which the sects break and discard, necessary to maintain the freedom and independence of the spiritual order against the constant tendency of the political order and material interests to invade and subject it?

This is the great question for American patriots and statesmen, and I have written in vain, if this article does not at least suggest the answer. Hitherto almost everywhere Catholics have found themselves obliged to contend against the civil power to gain the freedom and independence of their church, and at the same time, in these later centuries, to sustain that power, even though hostile to liberty, in order to save society from dissolution. Here they have to do neither, for here church and state, liberty and authority, are in harmonious relation, and form really, as they should, but two distinct parts of one whole; *distinct*, I say, not *separate* parts. There is here a true *union*, not *unity*, of church and state—a union without which neither the liberty of the citizen nor the authority of the state has any solid basis or support. The duty of the Catholic on this question is, it seems to me, to do his best to preserve this union as it is, and to combat every influence or tendency hostile to it.

Donoso Cortés demonstrates most clearly that religion is the basis of society and politics, but he is apparently disposed to assert the unity of church and state, with European liberals, but differing from them by absorbing the state in the church, or by virtually suppressing it; while they would suppress the church or absorb her in the state. My

endeavor in what I have written has been to preserve both, and to defend not the unity, but the union of church and state. This union, in my judgment, has never existed or been practicable in the Old World, and I do not believe it is even yet practicable there, and consequently, I regard whatever tends there to weaken the political influence of the church as unfavorable to civilization, and favorable only to political atheism, virtually asserted by every European state, unless Belgium be an exception. But here the union really exists, in the most perfect form that I am able to conceive it; and for the harmonious progress of real civilization, we only need the church, the real guardian of all rights that exist independently of civil society, to become sufficiently diffused or to embrace a sufficient number of the people in her communion, to preserve that union intact, from whatever quarter it may be assailed.

This, we are permitted to hope, will ere long be the case. The sects, seeing their freedom and independence require its maintenance, must in this respect make common cause with us; and hence the spiritual power is probably already nearly, if not quite strong enough to maintain it against any and every enemy that may arise. As to the controversy between the church and the sects, I do not expect that to end very soon; but truth is mighty and in the end will prevail. They will, no doubt, struggle to the last, but as the state cannot intervene in the dispute, and must maintain an open field for the combatants, I have no doubt that they will yield at last, because the church has the truth in its unity and integrity, and they have it only as disunited or broken in scattered fragments. Reason demands union and catholicity, and where reason is free, and assisted by grace, she must win the victory.

THE BISHOPS OF ROME.*

[From the Catholic World for April, 1869.]

Harper's Magazine, we are told, has a wide circulation, and some merit as a magazine of light literature; but it does not appear to have much aptitude for the scholarly discussion of serious questions, whatever the matter to which they relate, and it is guilty of great rashness in attempting to treat a subject of such grave and important relations to religion and civilization, society and the church, as the history of the bishops of Rome. The subject is not within its competence, and the historical value of its essay to those who know something of the history of the popes and of mediæval Europe is less than null.

Of course, *Harper's Magazine* throws no new light on any disputed passage in the history of the bishops of Rome, and brings out no fact not well known, or at least often repeated before; it does nothing more than compress within a brief magazine article the principal inventions, calumnies, and slanders vented for centuries against the Roman pontiffs by personal or national antipathy, disappointed ambition, political and partisan animosity, and heretical and sectarian wrath and bitterness, so adroitly arranged and mixed with facts and probabilities as to gain easy credence with persons predisposed to believe them, and to produce on ignorant and prejudiced readers a totally false impression. The magazine, judging from this article, has not a single qualification for studying and appreciating the history of the popes. It has no key to the meaning of the facts it encounters, and is utterly unable or indisposed to place itself at the point of view from which the truth is discernible. Its *animus*, at least in this article, is decidedly anti-Christian, and proves that it has no Christian conscience, no Christian sympathy, no faith in the supernatural, no reverence for our Lord and his apostles, and no respect even for the authority of the Holy Scriptures.

The magazine, under pretence of writing history, simply appeals to anti-Catholic prejudice, and repeats what Dr.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine. The Bishops of Rome. New York: January, 1869.

Newman calls "the Protestant tradition." Its aim is not historical truth, or a sound historical judgment on the character of the Roman pontiffs, but to confirm the unfounded prejudices of its readers against them. It proceeds as if the presumption were that every pope is antichrist or a horribly wicked man, and therefore every doubtful fact must be interpreted against him, till he is proved innocent. Every thing that has been said against a pope, no matter by whom or on what authority, is presumptively true; every thing said in favor of a Roman pontiff must be presumed to be false or unworthy of consideration. It supposes the popes to have had the temper and disposition of non-Catholics, and from what it believes, perhaps very justly, a Protestant would do—if, *per impossibile*, he were elevated to the papal chair, and clothed with papal authority—concludes what the popes have actually done. It forgets the rule of logic, *Argumentum a genere ad genus, non valet.* The pope and the Protestant are not of the same genus. We have never encountered in history a single pope that did not sincerely believe in his mission from Christ, and take it seriously. We have encountered weakness; too great complaisance to the civil power, even slowness in crushing out, in its very inception, an insurgent error; sometimes, also, too great a regard to the temporal, to the real or apparent neglect of the spiritual, and two or three instances in which the personal conduct of a pope was not much better than that of the average of secular princes; but never a pope who did not recognize the important trusts confided to his care, and the weighty responsibilities of his high office.

We have studied the history of the Roman pontiffs with probably more care and diligence than the flippant writer in *Harper's Magazine* has done, and studied it, too, both as an antipapist and as a papist, with an earnest desire to find facts against the popes, and with an equally earnest desire to ascertain the exact historical truth; and we reject as unworthy of the most fanatic sectarian the absurd rule of judging them which the magazine adopts, if it does not avow and hold that the presumption is the other way, and that every thing that reflects injuriously on the character of a bishop of Rome is presumptively false, and to be accepted only on the most indubitable evidence. We can judge in this matter more impartially and disinterestedly than the anti-Catholic. The impeccability of the pontiff, or even his infallibility in matters of mere human prudence, is no article

of Catholic faith. The personal conduct of a pontiff may be objectionable; but unless he officially teaches error in doctrine, or enjoins an immoral practice on the faithful, it cannot disturb us. There are no instances in which a pope has done this. No pope has ever taught or enjoined vice for virtue, error for truth, or officially sanctioned a false principle or a false motive of action. With one exception, we might, then, concede all the magazine alleges, and ask, What then? What can you conclude? But in fact we concede nothing. What it alleges against the bishops of Rome is either historically false, or if not, is, when rightly understood, nothing against them in their official capacity.

The exception mentioned is that of St Liberius. The magazine repeats, with some variations, the exploded fable that this holy pope, won by favors or terrified by threats, consented to a condemnation of the *doctrine* of Athanasius, that is, signed an Arian formula of faith. It has not invented the slander, but it has, after what historical criticism has established on the subject, no right to repeat it as if it were not denied. We have no space now to treat the question at length; but we assert, after a very full investigation, that St Liberius never signed an Arian formula, never in any shape or manner condemned the *doctrine* defended by St. Athanasius, and consequently never recanted, for he had nothing to recant. The most, if so much, that can be maintained is, that he approved a sentence condemning the special error of the Eunomians, in which was not inserted the word "consubstantial," because it was not necessary to the condemnation of their special error, and the error they held in common with all Arians had already been condemned by the Council of Nicæa. Not a word can be truly alleged against the persistent orthodoxy of this great and holy pontiff, who deserves, as he has always received, the veneration of the church.

The magazine repeats the slander of an anonymous writer, a bitter enemy of the popes, against St. Victor, St. Zephyrinus, and St. Callistus, three popes whom the church of Rome has held, and still holds, in high esteem and veneration for their virtues and saintly character. It refers to the *Philosophoumena*, a work published a few years ago by M. E. Miller of Paris, variously attributed to Origen, to St. Hippolytus, bishop of Porto, near Rome, to Caius, a Roman presbyter, and to Tertullian. The late Abbé Cruice—an Irishman by birth, we believe, but brought up and natural-

ized in France, where he was, shortly before his death, promoted to the episcopate—a profoundly learned man and an acute critic, has unanswerably proved that these are all unsustainable hypotheses, and that historical science is in no condition to say who was its author. Who wrote it, or where it was written, is absolutely unknown, but from internal evidence the writer was a contemporary of the three popes named, and was probably some oriental schismatic, of unsound faith, and a bitter enemy of the popes. The work is not of the slightest authority against the bishops of Rome, but is of very great value as proving, by an enemy, that the papacy was fully developed—if that is the word—claiming and exercising in the universal church the same supreme authority that it claims and exercises now, and was as regular in its action in the last half of the second century, or within fifty or sixty years of the death of the Apostle St. John, as it is under Pope Pius IX. now gloriously reigning.*

When the magazine has nothing else to allege against the popes, it accuses them of "a fierce, ungovernable pride."

"The fourth century brought important changes in the condition of the bishops of Rome. It is a singular trait of the corrupt Christianity of this period that the chief characteristic of the eminent prelates was a fierce and ungovernable pride. Humility had long ceased to be numbered among the Christian virtues. The four great rulers of the church, the bishop of Rome and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, were engaged in a constant struggle for supremacy. Even the inferior bishops assumed a princely estate, and surrounded themselves with their sacred courts. The vices of pride and arrogance descended to the lower orders of the clergy: the emperor himself was declared to be inferior in dignity to the simple presbyter, and in all public entertainments and ceremonious assemblies the proudest layman was expected to take his place below the haughty churchman. As learning declined, and the world sank into a new barbarism, the clergy elevated themselves into a ruling caste, and were looked upon as half divine by the rude Goths and the degraded Romans. It is even said that the pagan nations of the west transferred to the priest and monk the same awe-struck reverence which they had been accustomed to pay to their Druid teachers. The pope took the place of their chief Druid, and was worshipped with idolatrous devotion; the meanest presbyter, however vicious and degraded, seemed, to the ignorant savages, a true messenger from the skies."

---

* *Vid. Histoire de l' Église de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, de St. Zéphirin, et St. Calliste.* Par L'Abbé M. P. Cruice.

There was no patriarch of Constantinople in the fourth century, and it was only in 330 that the city of Constantinople absorbed Byzantium. The bishop of Byzantium was not a patriarch, or even a metropolitan, but was a suffragan of the bishop of Heraclea. It was not till long after the fourth century that the bishop of Constantinople was recognized as patriarch, not, in fact, till the eighth general council. There was no struggle in the fourth nor in any subsequent century, for the supremacy, between Rome and Antioch, or Rome and Alexandria; neither the patriarch of Antioch nor the patriarch of Alexandria ever claimed the primacy; but both acknowledged that it belonged to the bishop of Rome, as do the schismatic churches of the East even now, though they take the liberty of disobeying their lawful superior. In the fifth century, when St. Leo the Great was pope, the bishop of Constantinople claimed the *second* rank, or the first *after* the bishop of Rome, on the ground that Constantinople was the new Rome, the second capital of the empire. St. Leo repulsed his claim, not in defence of his own rights, for it did not interfere with his supremacy, or primacy, as they said then, but in defence of the rights of the churches of Antioch and Alexandria. He also did it because the claim was urged on a false principle —that the authority of a bishop is derived from the civil importance of the city in which his see is established.

It is not strange that the magazine should complain that the pontifical dignity was placed above the imperial, and that the simple presbyter took the step of the proudest layman; yet whoever believes in the spiritual order at all, believes it superior to the secular order, and therefore that they who represent the spiritual are in dignity above those who represent only the secular. When the writer of this was a Protestant minister, he took, and was expected to take, precedence of the laity. The common sense of mankind gives the precedence to those held to be invested with the sacred functions of religion, or clothed with spiritual authority.

That St. Jerome from his monastic cell near Jerusalem, inveighs against the vices and corruptions of the Roman clergy, as alleged in the paragraph following the one we have quoted, is very true; but his declamations must be taken with some grains of allowance. St. Jerome was not accustomed to measure his words when denouncing wrong, and saints generally are not. St. Peter Damian reported,

after his official visit to Spain, that there was but one worthy priest in the whole kingdom, which really meant no more than that he found only one who came, in all respects, up to his lofty ideal of what a priest should be. Yet there might have been, and probably were, large numbers of others who, though not faultless, were very worthy men, and upon the whole, faithful priests. We must never take the exaggerations of saintly reformers, burning with zeal for the faith and the salvation of souls, as literal historical facts. St. Jerome, in his ardent love of the church and his high ideal of sacerdotal purity, vigilance, fidelity, and zeal, no doubt exaggerated.

There can be nothing more offensive to every right and honorable feeling than the exultation of the magazine over the abuse, cruelties, and outrages inflicted on a bishop of Rome by civil tyrants. The writer, had he lived under the persecuting pagan emperors, would have joined his voice to that of those who exclaimed, *Christianos ad leones;* or had he been present when our Lord was arrested and brought as a malefactor before Pontius Pilate, none louder than he would have cried out *Crucifige eum ! crucifige eum !* His sympathies are uniformly with the oppressor, never, as we can discover, with the oppressed; with the tyrant, never with his innocent victim, especially if that victim be a bishop of Rome. He feels only gratification in recording the wrongs and sufferings of Pope St. Silverus. This pope was raised to the papacy by the tyranny of the Arian king Theodotus, and ordained by force without the necessary subscription of the clergy. But after his consecration, the clergy, by their subscription, healed the irregularity of his election, as Anastasius the Librarian tells us, so as to preserve the unity of the church and religion. He appears to have been a holy man and a worthy pope; but he was not acceptable to Vigilius, who expected, by favor of the imperial court, to be made pope himself, nor to those two profligate women, the Empress Theodora and her friend Antonina, the wife of the patrician Belisarius. Vigilius and these two infamous women compelled Belisarius to depose him, strip him of his pontifical robes, clothe him with the habit of a monk, and send him into exile; where, as some say, he was assassinated, and as others say, he perished of hunger. The magazine relates this to show how low and unworthy the bishops of Rome had become! Vigilius succeeded St. Silverus, and it continues:

"Stained with crime, a false witness and a murderer, Vigilius had obtained his holy office through the power of two profligate women who now ruled the Roman world. Theodora, the dissolute wife of Justinian, and Antonina, her devoted servant, assumed to determine the faith and the destinies of the Christian Church. Vigilius failed to satisfy the exacting demands of his casuistical mistresses; he even ventured to differ from them upon some obscure points of doctrine. His punishment soon followed, and the bishop of Rome is said to have been dragged through the streets of Constantinople with a rope around his neck, to have been imprisoned in a common dungeon and fed on bread and water. The papal chair, filled by such unworthy occupants, must have sunk low in the popular esteem, had not Gregory the Great, toward the close of the sixth century, revived the dignity of the office."

We know of nothing that can be said in defence of the conduct of Vigilius prior to his accession to the papal throne. His intrigues with Theodora to be made pope, and his promises to her to restore, when he should be pope, Anthemus, deposed from the see of Constantinople by St. Agapitus for heresy, and to set aside the council of Chalcedon, were most scandalous; and his treatment of St. Silverus, whether he actually exiled him and had a hand in his death or not, admits, as far as we are informed, of no palliation; but his conduct thus far was not the conduct of the pope; and after he became bishop of Rome, at least after the death of his deposed predecessor, his conduct was, upon the whole, irreproachable. He conceded much for the sake of peace, and was much blamed; but he conceded nothing of the faith; he refused to fulfil the improper promises he had made, before becoming pope, to the empress, confessed that he had made them, said he was wrong in making them, retracted them, and resisted with rare firmness and persistence the Emperor Justinian in the matter of the three chapters, and fully expiated the offences committed prior to his elevation, by enduring for seven long years the brutal outrages and indignities offered him by the half-savage Justinian, the imperial courtiers, and intriguing and unscrupulous prelates of the court party—outrages and sufferings of which he died after his liberation on his journey back from Constantinople to Rome.

We have touched on these details for the purpose of showing that the principal offenders in the transactions related were not the bishops of Rome, but the civil authorities and their adherents, that deprived the Roman clergy and the popes of their proper freedom. If the papal chair

was filled with unworthy occupants, and had sunk low in the public esteem, it was because the emperor or empress at Constantinople and the Arian and barbarian kings in Italy sought to raise to it creatures of their own. They deprived the Roman clergy, the senate, and people of the free exercise of their right to elect the pope; and the pope, after his election, of his freedom of action, if he refused to conform to their wishes, usually criminal, and always base. Yet *Harper's Magazine* lays all the blame to the popes themselves, and seems to hold them responsible for the crimes and tyranny, the profligacy and lawless will of which they were the victims. If the wolf devoured the lamb, was it not the lamb's fault?

St. Gregory the Great was of a wealthy and illustrious family, and therefore finds some favor with the magazine; yet it calls him "a half-maddened enthusiast," and accuses him of "unsparing severity," and "excessive cruelty" in the treatment of his monks before his elevation to the papal chair. But his complaisance to the usurper Phocas, which we find it hard to excuse, and especially his disclaiming the title of "Universal Bishop," redeem him in its estimation.

"A faint trace of modesty and humility still characterized the Roman bishops, and they expressly disclaimed any right to the supremacy of the Christian world. The patriarch of Constantinople, who seems to have looked with a polished contempt upon his western brother, the tenant of fallen Rome and the bishop of the barbarians, now declared himself the Universal Bishop and the head of the subject Church. But Gregory repelled his usurpation with vigor. 'Whoever calls himself Universal Bishop is Antichrist,' he exclaimed; and he compares the patriarch to Satan, who in his pride had aspired to be higher than the angels."

John Jejunator, bishop of Constantinople, did not claim the primacy, which belonged to the bishop of Rome, nor did Gregory disclaim it; but called himself "œcumenical patriarch." The title he assumed derogated not from the rights and privileges of the apostolic see, but from those of the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. It was unauthorized, and showed culpable ambition and an encroaching disposition. St. Gregory, therefore, rebuked the bishop of Constantinople, and alleged the example of his predecessor, St. Leo the Great, who refused the title of "œcumenical bishop" when it was offered him by the fathers of Chalcedon. It is a title never assumed or borne by a bishop of

Rome, who, in his capacity as bishop, is the equal, and only the equal, of his brother bishops. All bishops are equal, as St. John Chrysostom tells us. The authority which the pope exercises over the bishops of the Catholic Church is not the episcopal, but the apostolical authority which he inherits from Peter, the prince of the apostles. St. Gregory disclaimed and condemned the title of "universal bishop," which was appropriate neither to him nor to any other bishop; but he did not disclaim the apostolic authority held as the successor of Peter. He actually claimed and exercised it in the very letter in which he rebukes the bishop of Constantinople. The magazine is wholly mistaken in asserting that Gregory disclaimed the papal supremacy. He did no such thing; he both claimed and exercised it, and few popes have exercised it more extensively or more vigorously.

The magazine is also mistaken is asserting that St. Leo III. crowned Charlemagne "Emperor of the West." Charlemagne was already hereditary patrician of Rome, and bound by his office to maintain order in the city and territories of Rome, and to defend the Holy See, or the Roman church, against its enemies. All the pope did was to raise the patrician to the imperial dignity, without any territorial title. Charles never assumed or bore the title of Emperor of the West. His official title was "Rex Francorum et Longobardorum Imperator." The title of "Emperor of the West," or "Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire," which his German successors assumed, was never conferred by the pope, but only acquiesced in after it had been usurped. The pope conferred on Charlemagne no authority out of the papal states.

We have no space here to discuss the origin of the temporal sovereignty of the bishops of Rome, nor the ground of that arbitratorship which the popes, during several ages, unquestionably exercised with regard to the sovereign princes bound by their profession and the constitution of their states to profess and protect the Catholic religion. But we can tell *Harper's Magazine* that it entirely misapprehends the character of St. Gregory VII., and the nature and motive of the struggle between him and Henry III., or Henry IV., as some reckon, king of the Germans, for emperor he never was. Gregory was no innovator; he introduced, and attempted to introduce, no change in the doctrine or discipline of the church, nor in the relations of

church and state. He only sought to correct abuses, to restore the ancient discipline which had, through various causes, become relaxed, and to assert and maintain the freedom and independence of the church in the government of her own spiritual subjects in all matters spiritual.

"His elevation was the signal for the most wonderful change in the character and purposes of the church. The pope aspired to rule mankind. He claimed an absolute power over the conduct of kings, priests, and nations, and he enforced his decrees by the terrible weapons of anathema and excommunication. He denounced the marriages of the clergy as impious, and at once there arose all over Europe a fearful struggle between the ties of natural affection and the iron will of Gregory. Heretofore the secular priests and bishops had married, raised families, and lived blamelessly as husbands or fathers, in the enjoyment of marital and filial love. But suddenly all this was changed. The married priests were declared polluted and degraded, and were branded with ignominy and shame. Wives were torn from their devoted husbands, children were declared bastards, and the ruthless monk, in the face of the fiercest opposition, made celibacy the rule of the church. The most painful consequences followed. The wretched women, thus degraded and accursed, were often driven to suicide in their despair. Some threw themselves into the flames; others were found dead in their beds, the victims of grief or of their own resolution not to survive their shame, while the monkish chroniclers exult over their misfortunes, and triumphantly consign them to eternal woe.

"Thus the clergy under Gregory's guidance became a monastic order, wholly separated from all temporal interests, and bound in a perfect obedience to the church. He next forbade all lay investitures or appointments to bishopries or other clerical offices, and declared himself the supreme ruler of the ecclesiastical affairs of nations. No temporal sovereign could fill the great European sees, or claim any dominion over the extensive territories held by eminent churchmen in right of their spiritual power. It was against this claim that the Emperor of Germany, Henry IV., rebelled. The great bishopries of his empire, Cologne, Bremen, Treves, and many others, were his most important feudatories, and should he suffer the imperious pope to govern them at will, his own dominion would be reduced to a shadow. And now began the famous contest between Hildebrand and Henry, between the carpenter's son and the successor of Charlemagne, between the Emperor of Germany and the Head of the Church."

This heart-rending picture is, to a great extent, a fancy piece. The celibacy of the clergy was the law of the church and of the German empire; and every priest knew it before taking orders. These pretended marriages were, in both

the ecclesiastical courts and the civil courts, no marriages at all; and these despairing wives of priests were simply concubines. What did Gregory do, but his best to enforce the law which the emperors had suffered to fall into desuetude? The right of investiture was always in the pope, and it was only by his authority that the emperors had ever exercised it. The pope had authorized them to give investiture of bishops at a time of disorder, and when it was for the good of the church that they should be so authorized. But when they abused the trust, and used it only to fill the sees with creatures of their own, or sold the investiture for money to the unworthy and the profligate, and intruded them into sees, in violation of the canons, and sheltered them from the discipline of the church—causing, thus, gross corruption of morals and manners, the neglect of religious instruction, and dangers to souls—it was the right and the duty of the pontiff to revoke the authorization given, to dismiss his unworthy agents, and to forbid the emperors henceforth to give investiture.

The magazine says that if the emperor should suffer the imperious pope to be allowed to govern at will the great bishopries of Cologne, Bremen, Treves, and many others, which were the most important feudatories of his empire, his own dominion would be reduced to a shadow. But if the emperor could fill them with creatures of his own, make bishops at his will, and depose them and sequester their revenues if they resisted his tyranny, or sell them, as he did, to the highest bidder—thrusting out the lawful occupants, and intruding men who could have been only usurpers, and who really were criminals in the eye of the law, and usually dissolute and scandalous in morals—where would have been the rightful freedom and independence of the church? How could the pope have maintained order and discipline in the church, and protected the interests of religion? At worst, the imperious will of the pontiff was as legitimate and as trustworthy as the imperious will of such a brutal tyrant and moral monster as was Henry. The pope did but claim his rights and the rights of the faithful people. It was no less important that the spiritual authority should govern in spirituals than it was that the secular authority should govern in temporals. The pope did not interfere, nor propose to interfere, with the emperor in the exercise of his authority in temporals; but he claimed the right, which the emperor could not deny, to govern in spirituals; and

resisted the attempt of Henry to exercise any authority in the church, which, whatever infidels and secularists may pretend, is of more importance than the state, for it maintains the state. He never pretended to any authority in the fiefs of the empire, or to subject to his will matters not confessedly within his jurisdiction.

Does the writer in the magazine maintain that the Methodist General Conference would be wrong to claim the right of choosing and appointing its own bishops, and assigning the pastors, elders, and preachers to their respective circuits; and that it could justly be accused of seeking to dominate over the state if it resisted, with all its power, the attempt of the state to take that matter into its own hands, and appoint for all the Methodist local conferences, districts, and circuits, bishops and pastors, itinerant and local preachers, and should appoint men of profligate lives, who scorned the *Book of Discipline*, Unitarians, Universalists, rationalists, and infidels, or the bitter enemies of Methodism; those who would neglect every spiritual duty, and seek only to plunder the funds and churches to provide for their own lawless pleasures, or to pay the bribes by which they obtained their appointment? We think not. And yet this is only a mild statement of what Henry did, and of what Gregory resisted. The pope claimed and sought to obtain no more for the church in Germany than is the acknowledged right of every professedly Christian sect in this country, and which every sect fully enjoys, without any let or hindrance from the state. Why, then, this outcry against Gregory VII.? Do these men who are so bitter against him, and gnash their teeth at him, know what they do? Have they ever for a moment reflected how much the modern world owes for its freedom and civilization to just such great popes as Hildebrand, who asserted energetically the rights of God, the freedom of religion, and made the royal and imperial despots and brutal tyrants who would trample on all laws, human and divine, feel that, if they would wear their crowns, they must study to restrain their power within its proper limits, and to rule justly for the common good, according to the law of God?

What Germany thought of the conduct of Henry is evinced by the fact that when Gregory struck him with the sword of Peter and Paul, everybody abandoned him but his deeply injured wife and one faithful attendant. The whole nation felt a sense of relief and breathed freely. An incubus

which oppressed its breast was thrown off. The picture of the sufferings of Henry traversing the Alps in the winter and standing shivering with cold in his thin garb, as a penitent before the door of the pontiff, is greatly exaggerated, and the attempt to excite sympathy for him and indignation against the pontiff can have no success with those who have studied with some care the history of the times. Henry was a bad man; a capricious, unprincipled, tyrannical, and brutal ruler, and his cause was bad. The pope was in the right; he was on the side of truth and justice, of God and humanity, pure morals and just liberty. Leo the historian, a Protestant, and Voigt, a Protestant minister, both Germans, have each completely vindicated Gregory's conduct toward Henry of Germany, though Harper's historian is probably ignorant of that fact, as he is of some others.

As to the pope's subjecting Henry to the discipline of the church, and depriving him of his crown, all we need say is, that all men are equal before God and the church, and kings and kaisers are as much amenable to the discipline of the church, acknowledged by them to be Christ's kingdom, as the meanest of their subjects. The pope assumed no more than the kirk session assumed when it sent their king Charles II. to the "cuttie stool." The revolutionists of Spain have just deprived Isabella Segunda of her crown and throne, with the general applause of the non-Catholic world, and no pope ever deprived a prince who denied his jurisdiction, or his legal right to sit in judgment on his case, nor, till after a fair trial had been had, and a judicial sentence was rendered according to the existing laws of his principality. We see not why, then, the popes should be decried for doing legally, and after trial, what revolutionists are applauded for doing without trial and against all law, human and divine—unless it be because the pope deprived only base and profligate monsters, stained with the worst of crimes; and the revolutionists deprive the guiltless, who violate no law of the state or of the church. The pope deprived for crime; the revolutionists usually for virtue or innocence, only under pretence of ameliorating the state, which they subvert.

But our space is nearly exhausted, and we must hurry on. Innocent III. is another of those great bishops of Rome that excite the wrath of *Harper's Magazine*—probably because he was really a great pope, energetic in asserting the faith, in removing scandals, in enforcing discipline on kings

and princes as well as on their subjects; in repressing sects, like the Albigenses, that struck at the very foundations of religion and society, or of the moral order; in defending the purity of morals and the sanctity of marriage, and in espousing the cause of the weak against the strong, of oppressed innocence against oppressive guilt. This is too much for the endurance of the magazine. It indeed does not say that Innocent did not espouse the cause of justice in the case of Philip Augustus and his injured queen, Ingeburga: but it contends that he did it from unworthy motives, for the sake of extending and consolidating the papal authority over kings and princes. Though he admits John Lackland was a moral monster, and opened negotiations with a Mohammedan prince to the scandal of Christendom, offered to make himself a Mussulman, and would have embraced Islamism if the infidel prince had not repelled him with indignation and contempt; it yet finds that Innocent was altogether wrong in taking effective measures to restrain his tyranny, cruelty, licentiousness, and plunder of the churches and robbery of his subjects. His motive was simply to monopolize power and profit for the papal see. He also, for like reasons, was wrong in resisting Frederic II. of Germany, who, he says, preferred Islamism to Christianity, as itself probably prefers it to Catholicity.

The article closes with a tirade against Alexander VI., and his children, Cæsar and Lucretia Borgia. Roscoe, a Protestant or rationalist, has vindicated the character of Lucretia, that accomplished, capable, and most grossly calumniated woman, who, in her real history, appears to have been not less eminent for her virtues than for her beauty and abilities. Cæsar Borgia we have no disposition to defend, though we have ample grounds for believing that he was by no means so black as Italian hatred and malice have painted him. Alexander was originally in the army of Spain, and his manners and morals were such as we oftener associate with military men than with ecclesiastics. He lived with a woman who was another man's wife, and had two or three children by her. But this was while he was a soldier, and before he was an ecclesiastic or thought of taking orders. He was called to Rome for his eminent administrative ability, by his uncle, Pope Callixtus III.; took, in honor of his uncle, the name of Borgia; became an ecclesiastic; was, after some time, made cardinal, and finally raised to the papal throne under the name of Alexander

VI. After he was made cardinal, if, indeed, after he be came an ecclesiastic, nothing discreditable to his morals has been proved against him; and his moral character, during his entire pontificate, was, according to the best authorities, irreproachable. The Borgias had, however, the damning sin of being Spaniards, not Italians; and of seeking to reduce the Italian robber-barons to submission and obedience to law, and to govern Italy in the interests of public order. They had, therefore, many bitter and powerful enemies; hence the aspersions of their character, and the numerous fables against them, and which but too many historians have taken for authenticated facts. The alleged poisonings of Alexander and his daughter Lucretia are none of them proved, and are inventions of Italian hatred and malice. Yet, though Alexander's conduct as pope was irreproachable, and his administration able and vigorous, his antecedents were such that his election to the papal throne was a questionable policy, and Savonarola held it to be irregular and null.

The magazine indulges in the old cant about the contrast between the poverty and humility of Peter and the wealth and grandeur of his successors; the simplicity of the primitive worship, and the pomp and splendor of the Roman service. There is no need of answering this. When the Messrs. Harper Brothers started the printing business in this city, we presume their establishment was in striking contrast to their present magnificent establishment in Cliff Street. When the world was converted to the church, and the supreme pontiff had to sustain relations with sovereign princes, to receive their ambassadors, and send his legates to every court in Christendom to look after the interests of religion—the chief interest of both society and individuals—larger accommodations than were afforded by that "upper room" in Jerusalem were needed, and a more imposing establishment than St. Peter may have had was a necessity of the altered state of things. Even our Methodist friends, we notice, find it inconvenient to observe the plainness and simplicity in dress and manners prescribed by John Wesley, their founder. He forbids, we believe, splendid churches, with steeples and bells; and the earliest houses for Methodist meetings, even we remember, were very different from the elegant structures they are now erecting. We heard a waggish minister say of one of them, "Call you this the Lord's house? you should rather call it the Lord's barn."

The Catholic Church continues and fulfils the synagogue, and her service is, to a great extent, modelled after the Jewish, which was prescribed by God himself. The dress of the pontiff, when he celebrates the Holy Sacrifice, is less gorgeous than that of the Jewish high-priest. St. Peter's is larger than was Solomon's temple, but it is not more gorgeous; and the Catholic service, except in the infinite superiority of the victim immolated upon the altar, is not more splendid, grand, or imposing than was the divinely prescribed temple service of the Hebrews. The magazine appears to think with Judas Iscariot, that the costly ointment with which a woman that had been a sinner anointed the feet of Jesus, after she had washed them with her tears and wiped them with her hair, was a great waste, and might have been put to a better use. But our Lord did not think so, and Judas Iscariot did not become the prince of the apostles. We owe all we have to God, and it is but fitting that we should employ the best we have in his service.

Here we must close. We have not replied to all the misstatements, misrepresentations, perversions, and insinuations of the article in *Harper's Magazine*. We could not do it in a brief article like the present. It would require volumes to do it. We have touched only on a few salient points that struck us in glancing over it; but we have said enough to show its *animus* and to expose its untrustworthiness. Refuted it we have not, for there really is nothing in it to refute. It lays down no principles, states no premises, draws no conclusions. It leaves all that to be supplied by the ignorance and prejudices of its readers. It is a mere series of statements that require no answer but a flat denial. It is not strange that the magazine should calumniate the popes, and seek to pervert their history. Our Lord built his church on Peter, being himself the chief corner-stone; and nothing is more natural than that they who hate the church should strike their heads against the papacy. The popes have always been the chief object of attack, and have had to bear the brunt of the battle. Yet they have labored, suffered, been persecuted, imprisoned, exiled, and martyred for the salvation of mankind. What depth of meaning in the dying words of the exiled Gregory VII., "I have loved justice, and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile." Alas! the world knows not its benefactors, and crucifies its redeemers!

FUTURE OF PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICITY.*

[From the Catholic World for 1870.]

ARTICLE I.

This work of serious and conscientious learning by the Abbé Martin, former curé of Ferney, noted as the residence of Voltaire when exiled from France, has been written mainly for the purpose of making known to Catholics of the old Catholic nations of Europe the real character and tendencies of contemporary Protestantism—a work not uncalled for, since those old Catholic populations, seldom coming into personal contact with Protestants, have not kept themselves well posted in the changes, developments, and transformations that Protestantism has undergone during the last two centuries, and are hardly able to recognize it in its present form, or to meet and combat it with success. The great controversial works of the seventeenth century, excellent as they were in their time, only imperfectly serve the present wants of Catholic polemics; for the dogmatic Protestantism they met and vanquished is, save in its spirit, not the Protestantism that now confronts the church. That primitive phase of Protestantism has passed away, never to reappear, and a new and a very different phase has been developed, which demands a new study and a new and different mode of treatment.

The learned Abbé Martin, favorably situated for his task, during several years, at the gate of Geneva, the Protestant Rome, has embodied in his volume the result of much serious and conscientious labor devoted to this new study, and has so well accomplished his task as to leave nothing to be desired, till Protestantism undergoes another metamorphosis, which it is not unlikely to do; for to assume new forms or shapes according to the exigencies of time and place, is of its very essence. For this reason, the labor of refuting or even explaining it can never be regarded as finished.

**De l'Avenir du Protestantisme et du Catholicisme.* Par M. l'Abbé Martin. Paris: 1869.

It is the characteristic of Protestantism to have no fixed and permanent character, except hatred of Catholicity. It has no principles, doctrines, or forms, which in order to be itself, it must always and everywhere maintain. It may be biblical and dogmatic, sentimental or sceptical, combine with absolutism or with the revolution, assert the divine right of kings and passive obedience with the old Anglican divines, or shout, *à bas les rois*, and *vive le peuple! vive la liberté, l'égalité, et la fraternité!* with the old French Jacobins and contemporary Mazzinians and Garibaldians, as it finds it necessary to carry on its unending warfare against the church, without any change in its nature or loss of identity. It is not a specific error, but error in general, ready to assume any and every particular form that circumstances require or render convenient. It, like all error, stands on a movable and moving foundation; and to strike it we are obliged to strike not where it is, but where it will be when our blow can reach it. The abbé is well aware of this fact, and sees and feels the difficulty it creates. Hence he regards Protestantism as imperishable, and holds that our controversy with it must, under one form or another, continue as long as error or hostility to the church continues, which will be to the end of the world.

To those of us who were brought up Protestants, who have known Protestantism in all its forms by our own experience, the Abbé Martin tells little, perhaps nothing that had not previously in some form passed through our own minds, and not much that had not already been published among us by our own Catholic writers. It is not easy to tell an American Catholic any thing new of Protestantism. There is no country in the world where Protestantism is or can be so well studied as our own; for in no other country has it had so free a field for its development and transformations, or in which to prove what it really is and whither it goes. It has suffered here no restraint from connection with the state, and till quite recently the church has been too feeble with us to exert any appreciable influence on its course. It has had in the religious order every thing its own way, has followed its own internal law, and acted out its nature, without let or hindrance. Here it may, therefore, be seen and studied in its real character and essence.

But if the Abbé Martin has not told us much that we did not already know, or which American writers had not already published, he has given us a true and full account of

the present aspects and tendencies of Protestantism throughout Europe, very instructive to those Catholics who have had no personal acquaintance with it, and not unprofitable even to those who, though converts to the church, were familiar with it only as seen in some one or two of the more aristocratic sects, in which large portions of Catholic tradition have been retained. We in fact wonder how a man who, like the abbé, has had no personal experience of Protestantism, who has never had any internal struggle with it, and has been brought up from infancy in the bosom of the church and in the Catholic faith, can by study and observation, by prayer and meditation, make himself so fully master of its real character, and come so thoroughly to understand its spirit, its internal laws and tendencies. No doubt one who has been a Protestant, and knows thoroughly its language, can find in his work proofs that Protestantism was not his mother tongue, and that he knows it only as he has learned it; but learned it he has, and knows it better than it is known by the most erudite and philosophical Protestant ministers themselves, and the Catholic reader may rely with full confidence on his expositions. The work is, in fact, an admirable supplement alike to Bossuet's *Variations* and to Moehler's *Symbolik*.

It will startle some Catholics, no doubt, to hear the well-informed author assert, as he does, that Protestantism is not dead or dying, that it is imperishable, its principle is immortal, and never was it a more formidable enemy to the church than it is at this present moment; but they will be less startled when they learn what he means by Protestantism.

"Protestantism," he says, "differs essentially from all the heresies that have previously rent the bosom of the church. It is not a particular heresy, nor a union of heresies; it is simply a frame for the reception of errors. Vinet, one of the most distinguished Protestants of the day, softens, indeed, this expression, and says that 'Protestantism is less a religion than the place of a religion.' He would have been strictly exact, if he had said Protestantism is less a religion than the place of any negation of religion under a religious garb. It is a circle capable of indefinite extension, of being enlarged as occasion requires, so as to include any and every error within its circumference. A new error rises on the horizon, the circle extends further and takes it in. Its power of extension is limited only by its last denial, and is therefore practically illimitable. What it asserted in the beginning it was able to deny a century later; what it maintained a century ago it can reject now; and what it

holds to-day it may discard to-morrow. It may deny indefinitely, and still be Protestantism. It can modify, change, metamorphose, turn and return itself without losing any thing of its identity. Grub, caterpillar, chrysalis, butterfly, it is transformed, but dies not."

All this is perfectly true. Protestantism undoubtedly differs essentially from all the particular heresies of former times, such as the Arian, Macedonian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Pelagian, &c.; but we think it bears many marks of affinity with ancient Gnosticism, of which it is perhaps the historical continuation and development. Gnosticism was not a particular or special heresy, denying a particular article, dogma, or proposition of faith. The Gnostics held themselves to be the enlightened Christians of their times, men who had attained to perfect science, been initiated into the sacred mysteries concealed from the vulgar, professed to be spiritual men, spiritually illuminated, and looked down with contempt on Catholics as remaining in the outer court, sensuous and ignorant, knowing nothing of the spirit. This is no bad description of contemporary Protestants. They call themselves the enlightened portion of mankind, claim to be spiritual men, spiritually illumined and instructed in the profoundest mysteries of heaven and earth; while from the height of their science they look down on us Catholics as simply sensuous men, having only a sensuous worship, and hold us to be a degraded, ignorant, superstitious, and besotted race. We are very much disposed, for ourselves, to regard Protestantism as Gnosticism modified to suit the taste, the temper, the mental habits, and the capacity of modern times.

The author makes Protestantism not a special heresy, nor yet a union of heresies, but the receptacle of illimitable denials; yet he throughout distinguishes it from absolute unbelief in Christianity and maintains that even as so distinguished it is imperishable, and its principle immortal. We confess that we do not see how he can make this distinction without giving to Protestantism a specific character and making it a positive heresy, and not simply a frame for the reception of heresy or heresies. Assuming it to be a positive heresy, and not the general spirit of error adapting itself to any and every form of error, his reasoning is far from satisfying us that it is imperishable. The assertion that "its principle is immortal," can in no case be accepted; for all error must ultimately die, and only truth survive, if our Lord is to overcome all his enemies, and God, who is truth

itself, is to be all in all. It is not to be supposed that they who are eternally lost continue to err and to sin for ever. They know and confess the truth at last, and it is their severest hell that they know and confess it when it is too late for it to liberate them. Understanding Protestantism to be the general spirit of error, we can concede it to be imperishable, in the sense that the world is imperishable; for men will hate Christ and deny him as long as the world stands; but in no other sense are we prepared to concede it.

The author defines the essence of Protestantism to be hatred of the church, and yet throughout his book distinguishes it from absolute infidelity or unbelief. We do not see the propriety of this distinction, nor understand how he can consistently exclude from Protestantism any form of error that hatred may assume. He makes Protestantism not a particular, a specific heresy, but the frame in which any negation of religion under a religious garb may be set. We see no ground for this restriction, and it seems to us that it contradicts his own assertion that Protestantism is a circle capable of indefinite extension, and practically illimitable; for if the circle can include only the denials of religion that wear a religious garb, it is not illimitable or capable of indefinite extension.

The learned abbé, we suspect, has been led into this real or apparent contradiction by neglecting to distinguish sharply between Protestants and Protestantism. Protestants are of all shades, from the Calvinist down to the Unitarian or rationalist, from the high-churchman down to the no-churchman. The great majority of them retain some shreds of Christian belief, read the Bible, look to Christ as the Redeemer of mankind, and are governed more or less in their opinions, sentiments, and conduct by Christian tradition. It would be a great mistake as well as gross injustice to represent all or even many of them as actually or intentionally unbelievers in Christ, or to hold them to be, in the way of error, any thing more than heretics. But Protestantism is not a form of heresy, is nothing in itself but hatred of Catholicity or hostility to the church of God; and there are no lengths in the way of denial it will not go, if necessary, for its gratification. It is potentially absolute infidelity.

This seems to be in reality the abbé's own doctrine, and its truth is evident from the fact that the general tendency of Protestantism is not toward Catholicity, but further and further from it. Individuals among them, at certain times

and places, even in large numbers, manifest decided Catholic tendencies, and ultimately find their way back to the church; but whoever knows Protestants well, knows that the mass of them, if driven by Catholic polemics to choose between the church and the denial of Christianity, indeed, of all religion, will not choose the church. "If I can be saved only by becoming a Catholic, I do not wish to be saved," said a Protestant minister to us one day. "I would rather be damned than be a Catholic." We politely assured him he could have his choice. This minister expressed only the too common sentiment of Protestants. A certain number among them, when convinced that Catholicity and Christianity are identical, will, the grace of God moving and assisting, become Catholics; but every day's experience shows that the larger number of them love Christianity less than they hate Catholicity, and will become infidels sooner than they will become Catholics. In doing so, are they illogical? Do they reject Protestantism, or simply follow out its spirit to its last logical consequences?

The learned abbé restricts Protestantism to such negations as wear a religious garb. But with us, in what is called Free Religion, we have seen infidelity itself wearing the garb and speaking the language of religion. In France there are the positivists, real atheists, who clothe themselves with a religious vestment, adopt a ritual, and observe a regular worship. These, if the author insists on his restriction, must be included within the Protestant circle, and if these are included, it will be difficult to say what class of enemies of Christ and his church are to be excluded. We see no good reason, therefore, for any restriction in the case. Protestantism is made up of negations, without any affirmation or positive truth of its own; and no reason can be assigned why we should not hold it capable of including within its circumference, without loss of identity or essential alteration, any or all errors against the Catholic Church, and if as yet only heretical with the many, why it is not capable in its developments of becoming downright apostasy, or complete denial of Christianity.

Taken in this sense, we admit that Protestantism is not dead, nor dying; but will continue to confront the church to the end of time. The church in this world is always the church militant. She will always have her enemies with whom she can never make peace so long as she remains faithful to her Lord. "Think not," said our Lord, "that I

am come to send peace on the earth; nay, a sword, rather." The synagogue of Satan stands always over against the church of God, and the world will always hate the church as it hated our Lord himself; for she is not of the world as he was not of it. Yet we attach no great importance, if this be its meaning, to the proposition, "Protestantism is imperishable," which the Abbé Martin labors hard and at great length to sustain; for it is only saying in other words that hatred to the church will continue to the consummation of the world.

But if the proposition means that Protestantism under its original or even its present form, as held by the mass of Protestants, is imperishable, we can only say, nothing proves it to our satisfaction. That the essence of Protestantism, which the author defines to be hatred of Catholicity, will continue as long as the world stands we do not doubt; but nothing proves to us that it may not change its form in the future as it has done in the past, or that the great body of Protestants may not gradually eliminate all that they have thus far retained of Christian tradition or Christian belief, reject even the Christian name, and lapse into pure gentilism, as they are already lapsing into carnal Judaism.

The abbé, while he is strictly correct when telling us what Protestantism is, that it is less a religion than the frame for the reception of all possible anti-Christian negations, yet seems in much of his reasoning with regard to its future to proceed as if he held Protestantism to be, not an immutable system indeed, but, after all, something definite and positive or affirmative. He knows as well as we do, and abundantly proves in his book, that Protestantism affirms nothing, contains as peculiar to itself no affirmative proposition whatever. The affirmative propositions held by Protestants are simply fragments of Catholic truth taught and held fast in their integrity by the church long ages before Luther and Calvin were born, and constitute no part of Protestantism. The Protestantism is all in the perversion, corruption, or denial of Catholic truth. There is nothing in it of its own but its negations and hatred of the church, her faith, her discipline, and her worship, to be continued, or that can be the subject of any predicate. Protestantism receives into its bosom one form of error as readily as another, and complete unbelief as the inchoate apostasy called heresy, though we readily grant that the majority of Protestants are not, as yet, prepared to accept infidelity pure and simple; and

many of them, we trust, are, in their intentions and dispositions, prepared to accept and obey the truth when made known to them, and may yet in God's gracious providence find their way into the Catholic communion and be saved.

The reformers, or the fathers of the modern Protestant movement, did not not give up Christianity or the church. They thought they could reject the papacy and the sacerdotal order, and still retain the Christian faith and the Christian church. But they were not slow to discover that this was impracticable, and that, if they gave up the papacy and the sacerdotal order, they must give up the sacraments, save as unmeaning rites, infused grace, the merit of good works, the church as a living organism, the whole mediatorial work of Christ in our actual regeneration, and fall back on immediatism, and deny all living or present Mediator between God and man. Their successors have found out that an irresistible logic carries them further still and requires them to reject all creeds and dogmas as superfluous, to resolve faith into confidence, and to rely solely on the immediate internal illumination and operations of the Holy Ghost. A new generation is beginning to discover that even this is too much, and is preparing to attribute to nature and the soul what its predecessors had attributed to the immediate supernatural operations of the Spirit. There is but one step further, and you have reached the goal, that of resolving God himself into the human soul, or the identification of God with man and man with God, and not a few have already taken it.

Protestant experience has proved that the Catholic system is homogeneous, self-consistent, all of a piece, so to speak; woven without seam, and not to be parted; that it must either be accepted or rejected as a whole. We do not say that all or the majority of Protestants see this; but many of them see it, and their vanguard loudly proclaim it, and declare the issue to be Catholicity or rationalism, that is, naturalism. There is no middle ground tenable, to a logical mind with a courage equal to its logic, between the two. It must be either the church or the world, Catholicity or naturalism, God or atheism. We know great bodies move slow, and the great body of Protestants will not come to a full conviction of this to-day nor to-morrow; but they are tending to it, and can hardly fail, in the natural course of things, one day to reach it. Having reached it, we think the sincere and earnest Protestants, who love and study the

Bible and mean to be Christians, will be gathered into the Catholic fold, and the others most likely, other things remaining as they are, will follow their Protestant spirit into naturalism, and give up Christian baptism and Christian faith altogether.

The author tells us that there are two very obvious tendencies among Protestants: the one a tendency to return to the church, and the other a tendency to rationalism and complete infidelity; but he thinks there will always remain in the non-Catholic body a certain number of honest, pious souls who shrink from unbelief, and yet, while they hold on to certain shreds of Christianity, will, from ignorance, prejudice and other causes, continue to protest against the Catholic faith. He supposes that among Protestants there are large numbers of such persons, who really believe in Jesus Christ, who really love his religion as far as they know it, who have real Christian piety, and actually believe themselves to be true Christians in faith and practice. These, he contends, preserve to Protestantism a certain religious and Christian character, and will prevent it from ever lapsing into complete unbelief and irreligion. They will always insist on some form of Christianity; and whatever the form they adopt, it will be Protestantism. He may be right; but we think, in discussing the future of Protestantism, he makes too much account of these pious persons; for if as well disposed as he assumes them to be, they can hardly fail, as time goes on, and the real character of the reformation becomes more and more manifest, to follow out their Christian tendency, and return to the communion of the Catholic Church.

Looking at the two tendencies among Protestants, studying them as thoroughly as we are able, and considering especially the essential nature of Protestantism, together with what we may call the logic of error—for error as well as truth has its logic—we think Protestantism as pretending to be Christian will, as we have said, finally disappear, and prove itself practically, as it is logically, the total rejection of the Christian religion, and therefore of Christ himself. In point of fact, Protestantism in its spirit and essence, as the author shows beyond contradiction, is only the revival under a modern form of the great gentile apostasy that followed the building of the tower of Babel, and must, if it runs its course, lapse either into no-religion, as it has already done with our modern scientists, or into demon-worship

and gross idolatry and superstition, as it is actually doing with modern spiritists right under our eyes. We look, as we have already intimated, for a separation of the wheat from the chaff, and believe the time will come when the real issue will be made up, and the battle we must wage be not with heresy, but with undisguised and unmitigated infidelity, rationalism, naturalism, or pure secularism.

We cannot give a complete analysis of the Abbé Martin's work; for it is itself little else than an analysis. But an interesting and important portion of it is devoted to the Protestant revival and propaganda, beginning in the latter half of the last century, and continued so vigorously in the present. Protestantism, seeking from the first the aid and protection of the princes, soon assumed in each country that adopted it the form and state of a national religious establishment, defended and governed by the secular power. Having no true spiritual life within, and defended without and provided for by the government, it fell, as soon as the religious wars occasioned by its origin had subsided, into a state of torpor, and the people under it fell almost universally into a religious somnolence. The establishment was sustained even with rigor, but personal religion was generally unknown or disregarded. Some individuals, seeing this, applied themselves to awaken in the torpid masses a personal interest in religion. From them began a religious revival, or a movement in behalf of personal religion, known in Germany as Pietism, in Great Britain and elsewhere as Methodism, which holds principally from John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield and Lady Huntington. This revival, which has done much to increase individualism, and to weaken the influence of dogma and church principles, and which have developed a species of evangelical illuminism resulting in a sort of infidel illuminism, as seen in our American transcendentalists and free religionists, has, upon the whole, the author thinks, injured more than it has advanced Protestantism. Such, we are sure, has been the fact in this country, unless we identify Protestantism with pure unbelief and indifference. Not one-fourth of those assumed to be "hopefully converted" in revival seasons stay converted, while the backsliders are worse Christians, and those who remain pious are no better Protestants than they were before their conversion.

The revival has, however, given birth to a vigorous propaganda in pagan and Catholic countries, and even in Prot-

estant countries themselves, by means of Bible societies, tract societies, home and foreign missionary societies, supported on a large scale and with apparently inexhaustible means. The author discusses this Protestant propaganda in relation to infidel nations; to mixed nations, or nations composed of Protestants and Catholics; and finally to old Catholic nations. In infidel or pagan nations he maintains that it has thus far been null. He maintains also that in all those Protestant nations, or nations in which Protestantism became the established church, but in which some remnants of the old Catholic population still remained and adhered to the Catholic faith and worship, the propaganda has, upon the whole, proved a failure, and in nearly all of them Catholicity has gained, and is still gaining, on Protestantism. This, counting from the date of the institution of the Protestant foreign and home missions in the beginning of the present century, is certainly true in Great Britain and Ireland, in Holland, Switzerland, especially in Sweden and Norway, and in this country; though the principal gains in England, Scotland, and the United States are due to the immigration of Catholics from countries under Protestant governments, or governments not friendly to the church. In the United States we are almost wholly indebted for the astonishing growth of the church to the migration hither of Catholics from Ireland and Germany. We have numerous conversions, indeed; but they form hardly an appreciable element in our entire Catholic population. In the English-speaking world there have been many conversions from the upper classes and from the ranks of the Protestant ministry, especially of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal communions; but very little impression is as yet made on the middle and lower classes, who must be converted before much progress is made in the conversion of a nation. We have certainly gained ground in Protestant nations, but probably not much more than we have lost in old Catholic nations.

While the Protestant propaganda has failed with infidel or pagan nations, and with the Catholic populations of Protestant nations, the author maintains that, allied with rationalism and the revolution, it has not been wholly unsuccessful in old Catholic nations, as France, Italy, Spain, Austria, and Hungary. It is, he maintains, "worse than idle to pretend that Protestant missions in these nations are wholly barren of results, or have met with only insignificant

success. Their success has been considerable, not perhaps in making Protestants, but in unmaking Catholics. Their missions are generally favored by the press, by the higher literature, and by the governments, which, even though nominally Catholic, are always jealous of the church, and ever encroaching on her rights and restraining her freedom."

The success of the Protestant propaganda in these old Catholic nations, the author thinks, is due to the reputation Protestant nations have of surpassing Catholic nations in material well-being; of having founded civil and religious liberty; and chiefly to the unpopularity of the clergy, the supineness of Catholics, and the ignorance of the Catholic clergy of the real character of contemporary Protestantism All these causes no doubt are operative; but the real cause, we apprehend, is to be sought in the ascendency acquired by the world in the fifteenth century, and which has invaded Catholic nations hardly less successfully than Protestant nations. Protestantism is the child of this ascendency, and its legitimate tendency is to place the world above heaven, and man above God; or the complete supremacy of the secular over the spiritual.

In its origin Protestantism seemed to be an exaggerated supernaturalism, denying to the natural all moral ability since the fall, and consequently assigning to the human will no active part in the work of justification or sanctification. But extremes meet; and the exaggerated supernaturalism in relation to the world to come proved to be only an exaggerated naturalism in relation to this world. To deny all activity of the natural in the work of sanctity is only emancipating the natural from the supernatural, from the moral law, and leaving it therefore free from all moral accountability, to follow without restraint its own inclinations and tendencies; for what is incapable of meriting is necessarily incapable of sinning. As the affections of the natural fasten on this world and the goods of this life, Protestantism soon lost practically all sense of the divine, as it is now rapidly losing it theoretically, and turned the whole activity of the nations that embraced it to the cultivation of the material order and the acquisition of material goods, leaving the spiritual order behind as a popish superstition, or an invention of priestcraft for enslaving the soul and restraining the natural freedom of mankind.

The spirit that generated and operates in Protestantism,

and which its doctrine of free or sovereign grace only fortifies, is, in fact, only the old heathen spirit that seeks only the goods of this life, and so pointedly condemned by Christianity. It reverses the words of our Lord, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you;" and says, "Seek first these things—the goods of this life—and the kingdom of God and his justice shall be added; if, indeed, such kingdom or justice there be." This spirit was not originated by the reformation. It had preceded it. It had originated the great gentile apostasy, and caused the carnal Jews to misinterpret the prophecies and to expect in the promised Messiah a temporal prince instead of a spiritual redeemer and regenerator. It had even entered the garden and induced the fall of our first parents. It has always subsisted in the world; nay, is what St. Augustine called the city of the world as opposed to the city of God, and which had its type and representative in the Roman republic and empire. It is the purely secular spirit emancipated from the spiritual, and substituting itself for it.

This spirit is everywhere warred against by Christianity, therefore by Catholicity: and during the temporal calamities of the barbarous and middle ages was held in check by the church; but the advancement of political and social order, the progress of well-being, the revival of pagan literature and art, the opening of new or long disused routes of commerce, and the discovery, in the fifteenth century, of a new continent with its untold treasures, gave new force and activity to the pagan spirit, and enabled it to pervade and take possession of the governments, never very submissive to the church, of the emperor, of kings, princes, and nobles, and, in general, of the upper classes of European society. Christendom was well prepared at the opening of the sixteenth century for a revival of gentilism, which found able and magnificent supporters in the Medici of Florence, so dear to modern uncatholic scholars, but so fatal in their influence on Catholic interests.

With the revival of gentilism or secularism there came the revival of the quarrel of pagan times between Germany and Rome; and Luther's movement derived its chief strength from its appeal to the old German hatred of Roman domination, represented in the fifteenth century, it was assumed, in part by the pope, and in part by the emperor, who pretended to revive the old Roman empire and

to succeed to the Roman Cæsars of the West. The Germanic nations, never thoroughly romanized, rebelled against the church, not because the secular spirit was more or less rampant with them than with the Romanic nations that remained Catholic, but because the centre of her authority was the old hated city of Rome, and they looked upon her authority as Roman, and incompatible with their own national independence. Nothing is further from the truth than to suppose that they were moved by a desire to emancipate the human mind from its pretended thraldom under the pope, or to establish free inquiry and the liberty of private judgment; for they yielded from the first to the secular or national sovereign all the authority in spirituals which had been previously exercised by the Roman pontiff. Wherever Protestantism gained a political status, the two powers, as under paganism —unless we except Geneva, Scotland, and subsequently New England—were united in the secular sovereign or the state. Calvin in Geneva, Knox in Scotland, and the Puritans in New England, though they sought to unite the two powers in the same governing body, sought to unite them in the hands of the church rather than of the state, in consequence of their misinterpretation of the Hebrew commonwealth, which, in fact, gave us the first example in history of the separation of the two powers, the sacerdotal and the secular, always asserted and insisted on by the Catholic Church.

The real character of the Protestant movement was a movement in behalf of nationalism—the distinctive feature of gentilism—revived by the insurgent worldly spirit. The church herself, in the nations that adhered to her, was defended against the so-called reformation, except by the theologians, not on Catholic principles, but on national principles; and hence the secular authority sought constantly to exercise a supervision over the church, and, as far as possible, to convert her into a national church. The so-called Catholic governments did not differ in principle from the Protestant governments, and have never done so since. They protected the church, to a certain extent, from recognized heresies, and provided for the pomp and splendor of her worship; but restrained in every possible way her full freedom of action, and compelled her to yield to their respective national policies in order to avoid a greater evil. The church could not fully instruct the people in any Catholic nation in the principles which should govern the

relations of church and state without incurring the persecution of her pretended protectors. Hence there grew up in all Catholic nations a false view of those relations, which greatly weakened the church and aided the growth of the secular spirit. Catholicity, having been supported, not as a Catholic but as a national religion, by Catholic governments and their courtiers, we find now, when the governments cease to defend it as a national religion, and are more hostile than friendly to the church, that the Catholic populations of old Catholic nations, never allowed by the secular authority to be fully instructed in the secular relations of their religion, and never accustomed to act personally in the intellectual defence of their faith, incrusted over with the secularism encouraged by their governments, are almost universally unarmed and defenceless before the Protestant propaganda, having in its favor the prestige of the worldly power and supposed well-being of Protestant nations, and of the championship of civil and religious liberty.

Here, we apprehend, is the real secret of the success of Protestant missions in old Catholic nations; not in the ignorance of the Catholic clergy of the real character of contemporary Protestantism, as the Abbé Martin maintains. He shows, perhaps exaggerates, the danger which the church runs in these old Catholic nations, and admits that it is becoming apparent, if not to all, at least to many of the clergy, and asks:

"How could it be otherwise with the French clergy, so learned, so pious, so vigilant, and so zealous? They are preparing themselves for the struggle; they proceed to the battle with the energy of faith; they lack not ability but they *lack a knowledge of contemporary Protestantism.* If they would struggle with success, if they would revive the glorious days of the Catholic apologetics of the seventeenth century, or rather, if they would create a new apologetics in harmony with the wants and errors of the times, they must study Protestantism in its latest evolutions and in its actual physiognomy."

No doubt there is more or less ignorance even among the French clergy as to the various phases and wiles of Protestantism, which their text-books will hardly help them to dissipate; but what seems to us to stand most in their way is precisely their need of studying Catholic theology more thoroughly in its relation to human reason and the secular order—a study they could hardly prosecute under what are facetiously termed "the Gallican liberties;" that is, liberties

of the government to enslave the church. No man who has learned Catholic theology as catholic instead of national, who has learned that the church represents on earth the spiritual order, and has the freedom and courage to maintain that the spiritual is superior to the temporal, is, in fact, the end for which the temporal exists, and therefore that which prescribes to the temporal its law, can ever be at a loss to understand or to know how to meet Protestantism the moment he sees it, whatever the particular phase it may exhibit. Protestantism is not and never was any thing but a series of negations, and all the advantage it has ever had or ever will have over Catholics is precisely in their ignorance of the real or intrinsic relation of the Catholic doctrine or doctrines it denies to the whole body of Catholic truth.

Protestantism, the author himself sees, is simply revived paganism; but what he does not see is that the state in all European nations has always been pagan, and never in its principle or constitution been truly Christian. Our own political constitution may be very imperfect, may be destined to a speedy end; but it is the first and only instance in history of a political constitution based on Christian principles; that is, on the recognition of the independence of religion and the supremacy of the spiritual order. It recognizes, in our modern phrase, the inalienable rights of man as its basis; but what the American statesman calls the rights of man are, in reality, the rights of God, which every human authority must hold sacred and inviolable. We pretend not that the American people or American statesmen fully understand or adhere practically to the American constitution, or that they ever will till they become Catholics and understand, as comparatively few Catholics even now do, the principles of their church in their political and social applications. Nevertheless, the constitution is based on the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order, which the secular order must always and everywhere recognize, respect, and defend. This is in direct contradiction of the principle of the pagan republic, which asserts the independence and supremacy of the state alike in temporals and spirituals.

But this pagan principle of the supremacy of the state has always been the basis of the European public law, and the church, though she has always maintained the contrary, has always been held in the civil jurisprudence to have only

the rights accorded her by the civil government. This has always been the doctrine alike of the civil-law and the common-law courts, always rigidly enforced by the French parliaments, and not seldom yielded by courtly prelates afraid, as in England, of the statute of *præmunire*. There have been individual sovereigns who personally understood and yielded the church her rights; but their lawyers never recognized them save as grants or concessions by the prince. Hence the interminable quarrel of the legists and the canonists, and the sad spectacle of the bishops of a nation not seldom deserting almost in a body the supreme pontiff in his deadly struggle with their civil tyrants in defence of their own rights, and the freedom and independence of the spiritual order. Hence, too, we see Italian statesmen, while pretending to acknowledge and confirm religious liberty, confiscating the goods of the church, and prescribing in the name of the state the conditions on which the bishops of the church will be permitted to exercise their pastoral functions. Hence it is, also, that we have seen pious and devout Catholics defend the revolution and preach political atheism in one breath, and the most rigid orthodoxy in another.

With all deference to M. l'Abbé Martin, we must think that what is wanting in the Catholic populations of old Catholic countries in order to resist the Protestant propaganda, is not so much a better knowledge of Protestantism, as a more thorough knowledge of their own faith, and of Catholic principles themselves, in relation to one another and to the secular order—a knowledge which has been hindered, and to a great extent prevented, by the paganism of the state, which has disabled the church from freely and fully giving it. Happily, the European governments by ceasing to be protectors of the church have in great measure lost the power, if not to afflict and persecute, at least to enslave her. The bishops, with only here and there an exception, no longer take the side of Cæsar against Peter, and see that their interests and those of the church can be saved only by the strictest union with and submission to the supreme pastor, the vicar of Christ. The supreme pastor himself, without consulting earthly potentates or conferring with flesh and blood, has pronounced in his encyclical and syllabus, a rigorous judgment on political atheism and paganism in modern society, and set forth the Catholic principles in which the faithful need to be instructed in order to resist the Protestant propaganda, supported by nationalism and

the revolution. He has asserted the independence and freedom of the church in convoking by his own authority, almost in defiance of the secular powers, an œcumenical council, to be held in his own palace of the Vatican, in which the universal church, aided by the Holy Ghost, will, we presume, deliberate and pronounce upon the errors of the times and indicate the means of arresting the evils that now so grievously afflict society, both spiritual and secular. Hereafter, we may hope, the faithful, cost what it may, will be more thoroughly instructed as to the relations of the two powers, and of faith to reason and civil society, so that an end will be put to the progress in Catholic nations of Protestantism, rationalism, and political atheism.

The Abbé Martin succeeds better in describing Protestantism as it is, and in setting forth the danger it threatens, than in pointing out the remedy to be applied by Catholics, or in assigning the causes of the defects he finds or thinks he finds among them. He does not see that these defects, in so far as general, are almost wholly due to the pagan constitution of the state, which has survived the downfall of pagan Rome, and to the fact that the church has never yet in the Old World had her full freedom and independence, but has always been more or less restrained in her action by the jealousy or hostility of the state. The lack of individual energy and self-reliance of Catholics in asserting and defending the rights of the church, which the abbé deplores, has its origin in the restraint imposed by the civil authority on the freedom of the church.

"Catholics," he says, "relying on authority, full of confidence in its unfailing promises, are quite ready to think that it is enough for them to preserve the faith in their hearts, and to perform its works, while the defence and preservation of the church is the care of Providence. This sentiment, very commendable, no doubt, is yet, when not joined to a masculine energy which counts no sacrifices, if needed, in sustaining the work of God, only an enervating sloth. Catholics—may I say it?—need the activity of individual forces, not, indeed, of that excessive individualism which, puffed up by pride, drives the Protestant over the dark waves of doubt, but that Christian individualism which, accepting by conviction the compass of authority, knows how to employ all its personal forces in its service. This individualism Protestants reproach us with lacking; let us prove to them the contrary, and show that individual action is quite as powerful and far more productive, when it is well balanced, measured, and subjected to wise rules, as when it wanders without law or discipline, and acts only under the varying impulses of

free inquiry. It is, moreover, necessary to enter into this way; for the time has come for Catholics to understand that they can henceforth nowhere on earth count on any support but from God and themselves."

The author adds that Catholics, not only nominal but even many practical Catholics, lack the individual energy

"that springs from profound faith, faith which goes to the marrow, and enters even the centre of the soul, and radiates from it in earnest convictions over all religious practices, over the entire life, giving to them their true sense and to it the right direction and end. Protestants accuse our church of materialism in her worship. . . . . .

"The charge is false when applied to the church and her worship, but is only too true when applied to her members. Hence the painful inconsistencies in their conduct. They are Catholics in the church, Catholics in essential religious practices, sometimes even in works of supererogation, but are elsewhere and in other matters hardly Christians. The *petite dévotion* is sterile; manly, robust piety alone is productive, and it is it alone that we must labor to diffuse. We should seek to make it enter into souls and become fused with their very substance. Catholic worship is the most admirable vehicle of the spirit of life; but souls must comprehend it, and be instructed to draw the spirit of life from it."

There is no doubt truth in this, and with but too many Catholics their religion is little more in practice than a lifeless form; but this, so far as due to the clergy, is due rather to their want of earnestness and zeal, which the author says they do not lack, than to their ignorance of contemporary Protestantism. We pay little heed to the reproaches of Protestants, more likely to mislead than to instruct Catholics; but we are quite willing to concede that in old Catholic nations there may be a want among Catholics of the sort of individual energy defined and demanded by the author; but, in the first place, we are disposed to think that his long study of Protestantism, which is based on individualism, and his observation of the part played by what Protestants call personal religion, have led him to overrate the importance of this outward individual zeal and energy in the church; and in the second place, he seems not to have sufficiently considered that they can hardly be looked for in a community accustomed for ages to rely on the civil power to look out for the defence of the church, and for her protection against heretics and heresies. In such communities the free action of the church has been crippled by the attempt of the state to do her work and only bung-

ling it, and in which no call for personal effort in preserving and defending the church externally has been made on Catholics as individuals. The evil results naturally from the condition in which Catholics must be found when abandoned by the government that had hitherto saved them from all necessity of any personal activity in their own defence against external enemies. It can be only temporary, if the church is left henceforth free by the government to appeal to the individual faith, love, and exertions of the faithful under her direction.

There is, no doubt, much tepidity, formalism, and momentary imbecility in the face of the enemy in old Catholic populations; for not the just nor the elect only are members of the church; but abandoned or opposed as the church now is by the governments, and thrown back as she is everywhere upon her own resources as a spiritual kingdom, forced to be even in old Catholic nations once more a missionary church in every thing except in outward form, and obliged to appeal directly to the faithful individually, there can hardly fail to be developed in Catholics the personal qualities which the author thinks they do not now possess. The need of a robust and manly piety to struggle with the world and the enemies of the church will very soon call it forth, where religion is free and faith is not extinct.

We cannot but think, if the author had experienced the vexations and annoyances that we have from the personal and individual zeal and activity of Protestants of the revival stamp, each one of whom acts as if he were an Atlas and bore the whole weight of the religious world upon his individual shoulders, he would much prefer its absence among Catholics to its presence. Not more troublesome were the frogs of Egypt, that came up into the kneading-troughs and the sleeping-chambers. It is not easy to describe the sensation of relief a convert from Protestantism feels on coming into the church and learning that he has now a religion that can sustain him instead of needing him to sustain it. With Protestants, the member bears the sect; with Catholics, the church bears the member. The sacraments are effective *ex opere operato*. We are disposed, moreover, to believe that Catholics best serve the Catholic cause by each one's doing in his own sphere his own allotted work. The unity of faith, and the unity of the spirit that works alike in all the faithful to will and to do, are sufficient to secure unity of action, and action to one and the same end, and to effect

with marvellous rapidity the grandest and most magnificent results. This, we think, is the Catholic method, quiet, peaceable, orderly, and, if less showy and striking than the Protestant method, less noisy and prosy, far more fruitful in results. The Catholic is sustained, the Protestant must sustain.

For our part, we are grateful to the author for his masterly exposition of contemporary Protestantism; but we hope we may be permitted to say that, while we do not deny the danger with which it threatens the populations of old Catholic nations, we think he exaggerates it, and supposes Protestant negations are more powerful than they really are. It may be that the Catholic populations are not at present very well prepared to withstand Protestant propaganda, allied as it is with rationalism and the revolution; but they cannot long remain unprepared. The revolution having, wherever attempted, resulted in the loss of old liberties without the acquisition of any additional civil freedom, must gradually lose its credit with the people, who must ere long be disillusioned; rationalism is too cold, too absurd, and too destitute of life to hold them in permanent subjection. Scientists and sciolists may adhere to it while its novelty lasts, but both the reason and instincts of the people reject it, and demand faith, religion. Protestantism, severed from the revolution and rationalism, is too much what the great Catholic controversialists met in the seventeenth century and vanquished for its revival to be able to gain and hold much new territory.

The real danger, in our judgment, is in the spread of secularism or the secular spirit among Catholics themselves. This is the only serious obstacle we see to the conversion of the American people to the church. Catholics here and elsewhere conform to modern civilization, and are carried away by its spirit. They follow the spirit of the age without knowing it; and though a Catholic may accept without scruple all the positive results of what is called modern civilization, he cannot imbibe and follow its spirit without great loss on the side of religion, which requires the renunciation of the world as the end for which one is to live and to labor. But there are even among Catholics very worthy men, men of excellent parts and rare learning, who virtually subordinate the spiritual to the secular. They have so far yielded to the secular spirit of the day as to place the defence of the church on secular rather than on spiritual

grounds, and defend her claims as the church of God rather as necessary to secure civil liberty and advanced civilization than as necessary to save the soul and secure the beatitude of heaven. They are, in some degree, affected by the philanthropy or humanitarianism of the age, and occasionally confound it with Christian charity, which loves God supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves in God, or for the sake of God.

These men pursue a line of argument that draws off the Catholic mind from the kingdom of God and his justice, and fixes it on those things after which the heathen seek, secularize it, and lead it to think that our Lord's mission had for its object the multiplication of earthly goods and securing earthly felicity. They unintentionally play into the hands of radicals and revolutionists, by influencing Catholics to strive after social instead of spiritual progress, and making them feel that the great work for the church is less to train men for heaven than to make the earth a more pleasant abode for them; or that the proper way for men to work out their salvation hereafter is to work earnestly and perseveringly for the progress of civil and political liberty, and the reform of political and social abuses. It can hardly have any but a bad influence on the Catholic mind to find prominent Catholics urging their Catholic fellow-citizens to make common cause with the most notorious and irreligious infidel and radical leaders of the revolution, as if there could be any thing in common between Catholics and men who demand liberty only to emancipate themselves from the divine law and to suppress the church, or at least to restrain her freedom.

But we are forgetting our author. Of the three causes he assigns for the partial success in old Catholic nations of Protestant missions, we have considered only the third and last—the alleged ignorance of the clergy of contemporary Protestantism, the supineness of Catholics, and their lack of individual zeal, energy, and self-reliance. We have ventured to differ in some respects with regard to this alleged cause from the eminent author, and to take a deeper and a broader view of the real cause of Protestant success. We have traced it to the ascendency of the worldly spirit which has given birth to Protestantism itself, and, even in Catholic countries, deprived the church of her rightful freedom of action. We see the cause in the false relations of church and state that have hitherto subsisted in Christian nations

in the oppression and restraint of the church by the state. The other two causes, the impression that Protestant nations surpass Catholic nations in material wealth and well-being, and that Protestantism has founded and sustains civil and religious liberty, we must reluctantly reserve for a future article.

ARTICLE II.

The Abbé Martin divides his treatise into nine books, each of which he subdivides into several chapters. In the first book he labors to prove that Protestantism is imperishable; in the second, he discusses the Protestant revival and its effects: in the third, he treats of the Protestant propaganda, or Protestant missions and their results; in the fourth, of the wealth and well-being of Protestant as compared with Catholic nations; in the fifth, of Catholic and Protestant tolerance and intolerance; in the sixth, of liberty and its influence on the future of Protestantism; in the seventh, of religious liberty in its relations with Protestantism; in the eighth, of the decline of Catholic nations and governments, and the progressive march of Protestant nations and governments; and in the ninth and last, of the union or alliance of Protestantism with the revolution, or the revolutionary spirit so active in nearly all modern society.

In our former article we reviewed the subjects treated in the first, second, and part of the third books, and reserved for our present article two of the three causes the author assigns for the partial success of Protestant missions in old Catholic nations, namely, the *prestige* which Protestant nations enjoy of surpassing Catholic nations in wealth and well-being, and of having founded and sustained civil and religious liberty. But these two causes, though treated by the author in his third book, really embrace the subject of the remaining six books. We cannot say that the author has so digested and arranged his ample materials as to avoid repetitions, or so as to bring all that belongs to the same topic under one head; but treats it partly under one head and partly under another. A glance at the titles of the last six books will satisfy the reader as well as the reviewer, that the subjects treated fall under two general heads. First, civil and religious liberty; second, the comparative wealth and well-being of Catholic and Protestant nations; and under these two heads we shall arrange our summary of the views of the author and our own comments. We begin with the last.

The author assigns, as we have seen, as one of the causes of the success of Protestant missions in old Catholic nations, the *prestige* which Protestant nations enjoy of surpassing Catholic nations in material wealth and well-being. That this *prestige* attaches to Protestant nations is a fact not to be disputed; but is it well founded? The author seems to concede that it is, and maintains that "there is in Protestant nations and Protestant individuals a superior aptitude and a greater eagerness and tenacity in the pursuit and acquisition of the goods of this world" than there is in Catholic nations and individuals.

"Place," he says, "Catholics and Protestants side by side on the same territory, on conditions perfectly equal, and leave each to act under the influence of their respective principles, and not a half-century will elapse before the Protestants will have taken in the material order a marked superiority. The Protestants will have the finest vineyards, the best cultivated fields, the greenest meadows, the most elegant mansions, and the freshest shade. They will have almost the monopoly of industry, commerce, large capital, the bourse, the bank, money at interest, and own all the mills and factories, if any there are. If you doubt it, consult Alsace and Strasburg, Nîmes, Montpellier, the environs of Bordeaux, the mixed Swiss cantons, and the conquests the American Union has made of the Spaniards of Mexico. . . . Wherever Protestants plant themselves, they are able to attain a preponderating influence in all civil affairs. With only a fourth of the population they will hold three fourths of the public offices, have the majority in the municipal council, the mayor of the commune, if not the adjunct, the highest grades in the national guard, the member of the conseil-général, the deputy, sometimes the senator, and the most widely circulating journal of the district, daily filled with eulogiums on their merit.

"It is the same on a large scale among nations. Who knows not that there are more wealth, more well-being, more comfort, eleganter houses, softer couches, more sugar and coffee, in England, Scotland, Holland, Prussia, at Zurich, Berne, Geneva, New York, than in Spain, Portugal, Austria, at Rome or Rio Janeiro?

"It would seem that there is a sort of *preëstablished harmony* between Protestantism and the earth, that they know and attract each other. Where the earth is most smiling and wears the richest decorations, it naturally becomes Protestant. In Switzerland, the richest and most fertile districts are Protestant, the rugged and barren are Catholic. The former, with their facile enjoyments, seem to invite to very forgetfulness of heaven; the latter only to raise and fix the affections above the earth, and can be made or become Protestant possessions only by force or violence."

We are not prepared to make quite so large concessions. Protestants do not monopolize all the pleasant, rich, and fertile spots of the earth. The fact may be true of Switzerland, but it is not true of the Italian peninsula nor of the Iberian, in which are the richest and most fertile districts of Europe; nor in point of climate, soil, and productions, does Protestant Germany surpass Catholic Germany. The *preëstablished harmony* alleged has no foundation in fact, and we have heard the contrary more than once maintained by well-informed Catholic prelates. Nor are we prepared to concede that, if you speak of the whole population, there is more comfort and well-being in Protestant than in Catholic nations. The peasantry of Italy, before the late political changes, had as much comfort and well-being as the peasantry of Denmark, Sweden, or Norway, or even Great Britain and Holland, and the peasantry of Austria proper are in the same respects better off than those of Prussia or Hanover. In no countries in the world is there to be found such squalid wretchedness as in those under the British crown, and governed by the head of the Protestant church. There may be more wealth in Great Britain than in France, but there is also more and far deeper poverty. France, by a war with all Europe, was prostrated in 1815; her capital was held by foreign invaders, and she was forced to pay millions by way of indemnification to the invaders, and to support an allied army cantoned on her territory to compel her to keep the peace; and she met her extraordinary expenses, greatly reduced her national debt, reasserted her freedom of action and her position as a great European power, and extended her territory by the conquest of Algiers, in less than fifteen years, under the restoration and under a Catholic government. No nation under a Protestant government can be named that has ever carried so heavy a burden so easily, or done so much in so short a time to lighten it. We have seen nothing like it in England, the model Protestant nation. Since 1830, France has ceased to be a Catholic nation under a Catholic government, and has to a great extent adopted the British industrial and commercial system. She has shown nothing since of that marvellous recuperative energy she showed under the Bourbons. She is burdened now with a constantly increasing national debt, her people are taxed for national and municipal expenses to the last cent they can bear, and there can be no doubt that she is relatively poorer and weaker to-day than she was during the last years of the restoration.

Our experience in this country does not warrant the concessions of the author. Placed side by side and in equal conditions with Protestants, Catholics have shown themselves in no sense inferior to Protestants in their aptitude to get on in the world. Their progress here in wealth, in comfort, and ease has been relatively greater than that of the older Protestant population; for they started from an inferior worldly position, and with far inferior means. To be convinced of it, we need but look at the schools and colleges they have founded, at the costly and splendid churches they have erected, and at the large sums they have contributed for the support of Catholic charities and their friends in Ireland and other countries, from which the majority of them have emigrated. With an intense Protestant prejudice against them, they have, in a very few years, risen in the social scale, gained a respectable standing in the American community, carried away the first prizes in law and medicine, and secured their full share of public offices both civil and military.

The United States have proved themselves too powerful for the Mexicans, we concede, and they well might do so, with vastly greater resources and a population three times as large. The Mexicans are only about one in nine of pure Spanish blood; the rest are pure-blooded Indians, or a mixed race of whites and Indians, and of Indians and negroes. Yet if our officers who served in the Mexican war may be believed, braver, hardier, more enduring or energetic soldiers than the Mexicans cannot easily be found. The feebleness of Mexico is not due to her Catholicity, but to her lack of it; to her mad attempts to establish and maintain a republican form of government, for which her previous training, manners, and habits wholly unfitted her. Had she, on gaining her independence of Spain, established monarchical institutions and not been influenced by our example and intrigues, and the insane theories of European revolutionists, she would not have fallen below her non-Catholic neighbor. No Protestant people surpass in bravery, boldness, enterprise, energy, national or individual, the Spaniards of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and they were far better Catholics than they or Spanish-Americans are now.

There is an important fact too often lost sight of in discussing the alleged superior aptitude of Protestants in relation to this world. We find nowhere braver soldiers, bolder

sailors, more enterprising merchants, or more ingenious workingmen than were the Venetians, the Genoese, the Florentines, and the Portuguese when in their best estate. A Portuguese sailor opened the way by the Cape of Good Hope to India; a Genoese discovered this western continent, which bears an Italian name; an Italian, also, was the discoverer of this northern half of the American continent; and it was a Catholic sovereign who aided the Anglo-American colonies to assert their independence. Yet Portugal, Venice, Genoa, Florence, when they were greatest, were Catholic, and their decline in later times is not owing to their Catholicity; for they were Catholic all the time that they were rising from their feeble beginnings and at the period of their greatest power and splendor, more bigotedly so, as our liberals would say, than they are now; and what did not hinder their rise and growth could not be the cause of their decline. They have declined through other causes, and causes well known to the student of the rise and fall of nations.

It is, no doubt, true that in France, Belgium, and Italy, and perhaps in other old Catholic states, Catholics, even when they are the immense majority, permit the public offices to be filled, and themselves to be ruled by Protestants, Jews, infidels, and such secularized Catholics as hold the state should govern the church; and we have often felt not a little indignant to find it so; but modern society in all Catholic states recedes from the old aristocratic constitution of Europe, and tends to democracy; and democracy, as our American experience proves, elevates to power not the best men in the community, but often the worst, the least scrupulous, the most intriguing, selfish, and ambitious. The fact may also be explained by the false political education which the Catholic populations have received. Under Gallicanism they are not instructed to regard Catholicity as *catholic*, and are taught to look upon politics as exempted from the law of God as defined by the church. For them religion and politics are wholly disconnected, have no necessary relation one to the other, rest not on a common principle. Their political education relegates religion to private and domestic life, to the personal and domestic virtues, and has nothing to say in public affairs. Why then should not Protestants, Jews, infidels, or merely nominal Catholics fill the public offices, and take the management of public affairs.

The French, and other Catholics, who see and deplore this, having received the same sort of education, make the evil worse by laboring not to bring politics up to Catholicity, but to bring the church down to the level of politics, thus lowering the one without elevating the other. They assume an attitude towards the government of distrust, if not of hostility, and exert their influence to jacobinize the church instead of destroying her, as the revolution would do if it could. Practically they are only Catholic instead of infidel Jacobins; and whatever their personal hopes and intentions, simply play into the hands of the revolution. It is not the church that needs liberalizing, but the state that needs catholicizing. The evil, the political imbecility of Catholics in these old Catholic nations, results from the divorce of politics from religion, or the withdrawal of the political order from its proper subordination and subserviency to the spiritual. It is the fruit of the so-called "Gallican liberties," and the remedy is not in the alliance of the church either with democracy or with monarchy, with Jacobinism or with absolutism; but in bringing the faithful to understand that the Catholic religion is *catholic*, and has the right from God to govern them alike in their public relations and in their private and personal relations; in their public and official life, and in their private and domestic life.

In all these old nations the predominant religion is Christian, but the politics are pagan; and Protestants take the lead in political affairs because they have succeeded in paganizing their own religion, and in eliminating all antagonism between it and their politics; while the Catholics are politically inefficient, because, owing to the paganism of the state, they have not been able to christianize their politics and bring them into harmony with their religion. They themselves sympathize politically with Protestants, but are less efficient than they, because more or less restrained by their religion. Eliminate, by christianizing politics, all antagonism between politics and religion, which now renders Catholics politically indifferent or imbecile, and enable them to act with a united instead of a divided mind, and they will show even a greater aptitude for the affairs of this world than Protestants, because they will act from a higher plane, from profounder and more luminous principles, and with the energy and tenacity of an ever present and living faith, instead of interest or expediency. But how can they

do so when politics in every state in Europe are divorced from Catholic principle, are pagan, and at war with Christianity, and to take part in them they must sacrifice their religion and give up heaven for earth?

It is not Catholicity that renders the Catholics of old Catholic nations politically imbecile, and that permits a miserable minority of Protestants, Jews, and infidels to control the state, but the lack of it; not the fact that they are, but that they are not thoroughly, Catholic. It is the paganism that rules in the state, and is the basis of modern politics, that renders them timid and inefficient. In all Protestant nations religion itself is paganized, and there is as little conflict between religion and politics as there was in old pagan Greece or Rome. They are torn, distracted, weakened by no internal conflict between the two powers; for the first act of the reformation was to subject the spiritual order to the secular. Hence, they can act politically with undivided mind and undivided strength and energy. They have conformed their religion to their politics. But in all Catholic nations the governments, and, therefore, politics are pagan, and really, if not avowedly, at war with their religion that remains Christian. Those nations are therefore distracted, divided, weakened by the irrepressible antagonism between pagan politics supported by the secular authorities, and the Christian religion sustained only by the church, crippled by being denied her freedom.

It is easy now to understand why Protestant missions in old Catholic nations should not be wholly barren of results. They are backed by the whole weight of Protestant nations, governments and people; they are aided by the real sympathies and tendencies of the so-called Catholic governments and the pagan politics of Catholics themselves. What is surprising is, that their successes are no greater. It is no mean proof of the life and power of the church, and of her divine assistance, that she is able to retain so strong a hold as she does on so large a portion of the old Catholic populations, and to bear up against so many and such powerful enemies, enemies within as well as without the fortress.

The explanation offered by the author of the facts he concedes does not wholly satisfy us. He attributes them to the influence of the Catholic faith in inducing a renunciation of the world, producing in the minds and hearts of the faithful indifference to it, and a disposition to live only for piety and heaven.

That Catholicity has, and was designed to have this tendency, of course, we ourselves maintain; but we have studied the Gospel and Providence as manifested in human affairs to little effect if the renunciation of the world for Christ's sake is not the very way to secure it. They who give up all for Christ have even in this world the promise of a hundred-fold, and in the world to come life everlasting. "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and *all these* things shall be added unto you." The true principle, both of political and domestic economy, is self-denial, renunciation. He who seeks the world and lives for it, shall lose it, since in so doing he violates the divine order, and takes as his end what at best is only a means. Other things being equal, then, we should expect a truly Catholic people to surpass in wealth and well-being, as in industry and virtue, a heathen, an infidel, or a Protestant people. Certainly, the inferiority of Catholic nations in material wealth and well-being is no argument against Catholicity; but it is, in our judgment, a proof that its government and people are not truly Catholic. We do not admit, to the extent the author does, the alleged superiority of Protestant nations, even as to the material goods of this life; but as far as they can claim any superiority over Catholic nations in this respect, we attribute it to what we have called paganism in politics, or to the fact that in no Catholic nation since the revival of pagan literature in the fifteenth century have politics been elevated to the Catholic standard and made to harmonize with the Christian religion.

The author concedes, also, that, during the last century and the present, Catholic nations have been steadily declining, and Protestant nations advancing. At the opening of the seventeenth century, the Catholic were the great and leading nations of the world. Italy, it is true, had begun to decline; Spain had attained its zenith; but the German empire was still the first power in Europe. France was succeeding to the rank of Spain, and Poland was regarded as the barrier of Catholicity against the North and the East, while England was weakened by revolution at home. Prussia was only a principality, though soon to become a kingdom, and the United States did not exist. At present, England is the undisputed mistress of the ocean, is a great Asiatic and a great American power, weighing heavily on continental Europe; Prussia is absorbing all Germany. The United States have the mastership of the New World, and are

exerting a terrible pressure on the Old; while, on the other hand, Portugal has become virtually a colony of England; Spain has lost a world, ceased to be a great power, and is worse than nothing to the Catholic cause; Poland is divided among her neighbors, and annihilated; Austria is expelled from Germany, and threatened with the fate of Poland; Italy, at war with the pope, throws her weight on the side of the Protestant nations. Russia and the new Greek empire that is to be are not Protestant; but, as schismatic powers, will sustain the Protestant policy as against Catholicity. France, if she has not declined, has abandoned her mission as a great Catholic power, and is as little to be counted on to resist Anglo-Saxon ascendency as Russia or the revived Greek empire.

The excellent abbé, however, admonishes us that this decline on the one side, and growth and preponderance on the other, is political, not religious; and indicates no decline in Catholicity, or progress of Protestantism. The Latin races, except in France, have declined; but the church has gained more members than she has lost. Only the Anglo-Saxon race, the bulwark of Protestantism, has advanced. Denmark, Sweden, and Holland, considerable Protestant powers at the opening of the seventeenth century, have lost their political importance. Holland is half Catholic, and the Dutch Catholics are not less devoted to the church, less tenacious of their rights, nor less politically active and energetic than the Catholics of Ireland, and even less distracted by questions of national relief or national independence.

One third of the population of Prussia is Catholic, and a larger proportion will be if she, as is likely, absorbs southern Germany. Not much reliance is to be placed on Prussia as a Protestant power. The future belongs to the Anglo-Saxon race—England and the United States—to be disputed only by schismatic Russia and the new schismatic Greek empire in the process of formation. This relieves the gloom of the picture a little.

But while we agree with the author that Britain and our own country are the principal supports of Protestantism and of Protestant politics, unless we except France, usually reckoned as a Catholic power, we do not believe that even the United States and Britain, acting in concert, are so formidable, in an anti-Catholic sense, as he represents them. The British crown has more Catholic than Protestant subjects, and its Catholic subjects are for the most part enfran-

chised, and beginning to exert a powerful and constantly increasing influence on the policy of the government. England is obliged to count with Ireland, not only as to Irish interests in Ireland, but, to some extent, as to Catholic interests throughout the empire. The Catholic population in the United States is rapidly growing in numbers, education, wealth, and influence, and is already too large to be oppressed with impunity, and large enough when not misled by foreign passions and interests, to prevent the government from adopting a decidedly anti-Catholic policy either at home or abroad. Were the United States even to absorb the Catholic states on this continent, it would be advantageous, not detrimental, to Catholic interests. Mexican and Cuban, as well as Central and South American Catholics would gain much by being annexed to the Union, and brought under the direct action of ecclesiastical authority, as are the Catholics of the United States. We see nothing reassuring, we own, to the so-called Latin races in the growth and preponderance of the Anglo-Saxon nations, but not much that is promising to Protestantism; for we cannot believe that Christianity has failed, or that the future society belongs to paganism.

The abbé does not attribute the decline of the Latin races to any religious cause, but finds its explanation—1. In the law of growth and decay, to which nations as individuals are subjected; 2. In climate—the southern climate tends to soften and enervate, the northern to harden and invigorate; 3. In geographical position; 4. In difference of temperaments; 5. Political constitutions; and 6. In accidental or providential causes, not to be foreseen and guarded against—the presence or absence of a great man, the defeat of a well-devised, or the success of a blundering policy, the gain of a battle that should have been lost, or the loss of a battle that should have been gained.

Most of these causes we examined and disposed of, some time ago, in a review of Professor Draper's works.* The first and second we do not count. We do not believe that nations, like individuals, are subject to the law of growth, maturity, old age, and death. There are no facts or analogies from which such a law can be adduced, and a Catholic nation, if truly Catholic, has in its religion a fountain of perennial youth. Whatever disasters befall a Catholic na-

* Vol. IX, pp. 292, *et seq.*

tion, if not absorbed by another, it has always in itself a recuperative power. We believe just as little in the influence of climate as one of the causes of the decline of the Latin nations. The climate under which they have declined is the same under which they grew up and became the preponderating races. The extreme heat within the tropics is less unfavorable to mind or body than the extreme cold of the Arctic regions. The Latin races have lived both in their growth and in their decline under the finest, mildest, and healthiest climate within the temperate zone. The ablest men, as scholars, artists, statesmen, and generals, of France have belonged to her southern departments; and we found in our recent civil war that the men from the extreme southern states, in their physical qualities, bravery, activity and vigor of body, and powers of endurance, were not at all inferior to the men of the more northern states. In fact, they could bear more fatigue, and suffer more privations, with less demoralization than the northern man. We make just as little account of difference of temperament. The southern nations, with the same temperament, were once the preponderating nations of Europe, and the French are in no respect inferior to the English, and in many things superior. Spain in the sixteenth century not only surpassed what England then was, but even what she now is; and there was a time when it was said of Portugal, the sun never sets on her empire. We do not believe much in differences of race; for God hath made all nations of one blood.

Geographical position counts for something. The nations that have ports only on the Mediterranean, or access to the ocean only through that sea, have been unfavorably affected by the discovery of the passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, and of this western continent in the fifteenth century. These maritime discoveries, which have changed the routes of commerce as well as the character of commerce itself, have given the advantage to the nations that open on the Atlantic, and sufficiently account for the decline of the Italian republics. The canal across the Isthmus of Suez, just opened, will do something, no doubt, to revive the commerce of the Mediterranean, but cannot restore it, because the Indian trade is not now of the same relative importance that it was formerly. The American trade comes in for its share, rivals and even exceeds it, and this trade, whether a ship-canal be or be not opened across the Isthmus of Darien, will be chiefly in the hands of the United States

and the western nations of Europe, for their geographical position enables them to command it. The insular position of Great Britain has also given her some advantages.

Political constitutions also count for something; but in the beginning of the seventeenth century, the political constitutions of the several European states, except the Italian republics, the Swiss cantons, and the United Netherlands, were essentially the same, that is, Roman monarchy engrafted on feudalism. Monarchy was as absolute in England under the Tudors and the Stuarts as it ever was in France or Spain, and the other estates counted for no more in her than in them. The Protestant states of Germany were not more popular in their constitution than the Catholic states, and Austria has never been so despotic as Prussia. We cannot, however, attribute much to this cause; for why have the Latin states been less successful in developing and ameliorating their political constitution than the Anglo-Saxon, if we assume that they have been?

The accidental or providential causes, in the author's sense, being measurable by no rule and subject to no known law, cannot be very well discussed, and we are not inclined to attach much importance to them. A nation is already declining, or past its zenith, if the loss of a single battle can ruin it; and on its ascending course, if the winning of one can secure it a permanent ascendency. Napoleon won many important battles, and yet he died a prisoner on the barren rock of St. Helena. A victory by Pompey at Pharsalia, or by Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, could not have restored the patrician republic or changed the fate of Rome. The republic was lost before Cæsar crossed the Rubicon. Great men play an important part, no doubt; but a nation that can be saved by the presence of a great man is in no serious danger, or that could be lost by his absence cannot be saved by his presence. Individuals count for less than hero-worshippers commonly imagine. The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong.

Except in the loss of the commercial supremacy of the Italian republics by the maritime discoveries of the fifteenth century, we regard, though not in the sense of Protestants, the chief causes of the decline of the Latin nations as religious, and the ascendency of Protestant nations as, in the main, the counterpart of the decline of Catholic nations. The Catholic nations have declined, not because they have been Catholic, but because they and their governments have

not been truly Catholic. Something, indeed, is due to the fact that England completed her revolution a hundred years before that of the Latin nations began. She had passed through her principal internal struggles, established the basis of her constitution, settled her dynasty, and was in a position when the Latin revolutions broke out to turn them to her own advantage. She used the madness of French Jacobinism, and the o'er-vaulting ambition of the first Napoleon. Being earlier too, the English revolution was less democratic than that of the Latin nations, and did not so essentially weaken the nation by eliminating the aristocratic element. England is only just now entering upon the fearful struggle between aristocracy and democracy, and it is very possible that she will lose her ascendency before she gets through it. Still we find the principal cause of the deterioration of Catholic nations connected, at least, with religion.

Both the nations that became Protestant and those that remained Catholic were affected by the revival of Greek and Roman paganism in the fifteenth century. The northern nations, adopting it in politics, speedily conformed their religion to it, subjected the spiritual to the secular, abandoned the church, made themselves Protestant, and harmonized their interior national life. The southern nations adhered to the church, for there were in them too many enlightened, earnest-minded, and devout Catholics to permit them to break wholly with the successor of Peter; but their governments, statesmen, and scholars, artists and upper classes, adopted pagan politics, literature, art, and manners, and thus created an antagonism between their religion and their old secular life, which greatly impaired the influence of the church, and led to a fearful corruption of politics, manners, and morals. The cause of the deterioration of these nations is precisely in this antagonism, intensified by the so-called *renaissance*, and which has continued, down to the present time, and will, most likely, continue yet longer.

The Council of Trent did something to check the evil, but could not eradicate it; for its cause was not in the church, nor in the abuses of ecclesiastical discipline or administration, but in the secular order, in which the secular powers would suffer no radical reforms either in facts or principles. They were willing the church should reform her own administration, but would not conform their own

to the principles of which she was the appointed guardian. They would protect her against heretical powers; but only on their own terms, and only so far as she would consent to be made or they could use her as the instrument of their ambition. Charles V. would protect her only so far as he could without losing in his military projects the support of the Protestant princes of the empire; and when he wished to force the pope to his terms, he let loose his fanatical troops under the Constable Bourbon against Rome, who imprisoned him, and spoiled and sacked the city for nine months; Philip II. would also serve the church and make a war of extermination on heretics in the Low Countries, but only in the hope of using her as an instrument in attaining to the universal monarchy at which he aimed. Louis XIV., and after him Napoleon I., attempted the same. They all thought they could use her to further their own ambition; but they failed, and failed miserably, shamefully. He to whom it belongs to give victory or defeat, who demands disinterested services, and who will not suffer his church to be used as an instrument of earthly ambition, touched them with his finger and their strength failed, they withered as grass, and all their plans miscarried. It was better that her avowed enemies should triumph for a season than that she should be enslaved by her protectors, or smothered in the embraces of her friends. God is a jealous God, and his glory he will not give to another.

Here we see the cause. Paganism in the state corrupted the sovereigns, their courts, and the ruling classes in morals and manners, enfeebled character, debased society, in the Catholic states. The failure, through divine Providence, of the ambitious and selfish schemes of such professedly Catholic sovereigns as Philip II., Louis XIV., and Napoleon I., reduced the Latin races to the low estate in which we now find them, and gave, in political, commercial, and industrial order, the ascendency to Protestant nations, as a chastisement to both, and a lesson to Catholics from which it is to be hoped they will profit. If the Catholic nations had been truly Catholic, if the educated and ruling classes had recognized and defended the church steadily from the first on Catholic principles, and unflinchingly maintained her freedom and independence as the kingdom of God on earth, representing him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, these nations would have retained their preponderance, the church would have reformed the manners of so-

ciety, and the Protestant nations would never have existed, or would have speedily returned to the fold.

Yet we do not despair of these Latin races; for, though their governments have betrayed the faith, and the people have been alienated from the church by attributing to her the political faults of their rulers, from which she and they alike have suffered, they still retain Catholic tradition, and have in them large numbers of men and women, more than enough to have saved the cities of the plain, who are true believers, and who know and practise in sincerity and earnestness their faith. They have still a recuperative energy, and may yet reascend the scale they have descended. The present emperor of the French believed it possible, and his mission, to recover the Latin races. He attempted it, and his plan, to human wisdom, seemed well devised and practicable. It was to break the alliance between England and Russia; to create an independent, confederated, or united Italy; to divide the Anglo-Saxon race in the United States, and to raise up and consolidate a Latin power in Mexico and Central America, while he extended the French power in North Africa, defeated English and Russian diplomatic preponderance in the East, opened a maritime canal across the Isthmus of Suez, and recovered the commerce of India for the Mediterranean powers. By these means he would give to France the protectorate of the Latin races, and guard alike against Anglo-Saxon and Russian preponderance. But his plan made no account, or a false account, of the moral and religious causes of the decline of Latin races, and sought to elevate them not as truly Catholic but as temporal powers, and to use the church for a secular end, instead of using the secular power he possessed for a spiritual and Catholic end. He committed over again the error of his uncle, Louis XIV., and Philip II., and has failed, as he might have foreseen if he had understood that the church must be served, if at all, for herself, and that she serves the secular only when the secular serves her for her own sake.

The result of Napoleon's policy has been not to elevate the Latin races and to bring them to gravitate around France as the great central Latin power, but to weaken the power of the church over them, to strengthen the antagonism between their faith and their politics, and to depress them still more in relation to the Teutonic and Slavonic races. The emperor of the French, whether he had or had not Catholic interests at heart, has done them great injury.

He began by subordinating the spiritual to the secular, when he should have begun by subordinating the secular to the spiritual. He would then have secured the divine protection and assistance, and been invincible. He has, in reality, only defeated the end he aimed at, and left the Latin races in a more deplorable condition than that in which he found them. As a Catholic, and as a Latin sovereign, he has not been a success. The Protestant and schismatical powers have grown only by the faults and blunders, the want of submission and fidelity of the professedly Catholic powers; not by any means, as they suppose, by the errors and abuses of the ecclesiastical administration, nor by any positive virtue, even for this world, in their heresy and schism. God, as we have just said, is a jealous God, and his glory he will not give to another. The Latin races, so called, when in power sought not his glory but their own, and failed. But they may yet recover their former power and splendor, if not their commercial preponderance, by rejecting the subtile paganism which has enervated them, the infidel politics they have adopted; by restoring to the church her full freedom and independence as the spiritual order, and by subordinating the secular to the spiritual order; that is, by making themselves really and truly Catholic.

In France there was, at an early day, an attempt made to reconcile paganism in politics with Catholicity in religion, in what is called Gallicanism, which, however, only served to systematize the antagonism between church and state, and to render it all the more destructive to both. We look upon Gallicanism, as expressed in the four articles adopted at the dictation of the government by the assembly of the French clergy, in 1682, and which had shown itself all along from Philip the Fair, the grandson of St. Louis, which broke out in great violence with Louis XII., and his *petit concile* of five cardinals at Pisa, acted on by the *politiques* of Henry IV., and formulated by the great Bossuet under Louis XIV., as the most formidable as well as the most subtle enemy the church has ever had to contend with.

The essence, the real virus, so to speak, of Gallicanism is not, as so many suppose, in the assertion that the dogmatic definitions of the pope are not irreformable—though that is a grave error, in our judgment—but in the assertion of the independence of the state in the face of the spiritual order. No doubt Bossuet's purpose in drawing up the four articles was to prevent the French government from going

further and carrying away the kingdom into open heresy and schism; but the subtle secularism to which he gave his sanction, especially as sure to be practically understood and applied, is far harder to deal with than either heresy or schism, and it seems to us far more embarrassing to the church. It forbids the Catholic to be logical, to draw from his Catholic principles their proper consequences, or to give them their legitimate application; takes away from the defences of faith its outposts, and reduces them to the bare citadel, and proves an almost insurmountable obstacle to the church in her efforts to reach and subdue the world to the law of God. It withdraws the secular order from its rightful subjection to the spiritual order, and denies that religion is the supreme law for nations as well as for individuals, and for kings as well as for subjects.

The principal fault we find with the author, as may be gathered from what we have said, is that he appears to see in the antagonism between pagan politics and Christian, or in the original and inextinguishable dualism asserted by Gallicanism, no cause of the deterioration of Catholic nations, or of the partial success in old Catholic populations of Protestant missions in unmaking Catholics, if not in making Protestants. He seems to accept the one-sided asceticism which places the goods of this life in antagonism with the goods of the world to come, and though he does not avow Gallicanism, originated by paganism in the state, he does not disavow it, or appear to be aware that it has any influence in detaching the people from the church, by making them Catholics only on one side of their minds, and leaving them pagan on the other.

The enemies of the church understand this matter far better, and they look upon a Gallican as being as good as a Protestant. James I., the English Solomon, declared himself ready to accept the church, if allowed to do it on Gallican principles. Protestants have very little controversy with out-and-out Gallicanism. They feel instinctively that the Catholics who assert the independence, which means practically the supremacy, of the secular order, and bind the pope by the canons which the church herself makes, are near enough to them; and if they are not separated from the church, it is all the better, because they can better serve the Protestant cause in her communion than they could if out of it. It is the papal not the Gallican church they hate.

We do not agree, if we may be permitted to say so, with

the author as to the superiority of Protestant nations, or that they are likely to retain for any great length of time the superiority they appear now to have, nor do we accept, as we have already intimated, the one-sided asceticism which supposes any necessary antagonism between this world and the next. The antagonism grows out of the error of placing this world as the end or supreme good, when it is, in fact, only a medium. We as Christians renounce it, as the end we live for, but if we so renounce it, and live only in Christ for God, who is really our supreme good, we find this world in its true place with all its goods; and a really Catholic nation that holds the spiritual and eternal supreme, and subordinates the secular to it, will have a hundred-fold more of the really good things of this life, than a nation that subordinates the spiritual to the secular, and seeks only material goods. We believe, and the author proves it, that there is even now more real wealth and well-being in Catholic than in Protestant nations; though we agree with the author, that if it were not so, it would be no argument against the church.

ARTICLE III.

That Evangelical romancer, M. Merle d'Aubigné, not long since published a discourse having for title, *Jean Calvin, un des Fondateurs des Libertés Modernes.* The discourse, as the Abbé Martin says, is of no importance; but the title is significant. It claims for the Genevan reformer the merit of being one of the founders of liberty in modern society. Mr. Bancroft in his *History of the United States* does the same. A Lutheran might with equal truth claim as much for Luther, a Scottish Presbyterian as much for John Knox, and an Anglican as much for Henry VIII. and the Virgin Queen Elizabeth. Nearly all Protestant and anti-Catholic writers assume, as an indisputable maxim, that liberty was born of the reformation. All your Protestant and liberal journals assert it, and the ignorant multitude believe it. Whoever contradicts it is denounced as an ultramontanist, a tool of the clergy, or a Jesuit, and, of course is silenced. Protestant nations enjoy, even with many Catholics, the *prestige* of being free nations; and all Catholic nations are set down as despotic, and, owing to the influence of the church, as deadly hostile to every kind of liberty, religious, political, civil, and individual. Protes-

tantism and liberty, or Catholicity and despotism, is adopted as the formula of the convictions of this enlightened age.

This alleged connection of Protestantism and liberty, and of Catholicity and despotism, the Abbé Martin maintains, is what gives to Protestant missions in old Catholic nations the principal part of their success in unmaking Catholics. The Protestant missionaries, seconded by all the liberal journals, proclaim their Protestantism as the liberator of nations, as that which emancipates the people from political despotism, and the mind from spiritual thraldom. The great argument used in this country against the church is her alleged hostility to liberty, and the certainty, if she once gained the ascendency here, she would destroy our free institutions, and reduce the nation to political and spiritual slavery. Such is the allegation; such the argument.

Now, every man who knows any thing of history knows that the reverse of what is here alleged is true. The church has, undoubtedly, always opposed lawlessness, and set her face against revolutions for either king or people; but she has never favored slavery or despotism, and has always favored that orderly liberty, the only true liberty, which consists in the reign of law, instead of passion, caprice, or arbitrary will. She has always and everywhere insisted that the laws should be just and supreme, alike for ruler and ruled. She has sometimes submitted to despotic authority, but she has never approved it, or recognized it as legitimate; and when a courtier monk preached before Philip II. of Spain that the king is absolute, and may do whatever he wills, the Spanish inquisition arraigned him for his false doctrine, and compelled him to retract it publicly from the same pulpit from which he had preached it.

The fact is, not that liberty was born of or with the reformation, but that the reformation itself was born of absolute monarchy, despotism, or cæsarism, revived and confirmed at the epoch of its birth. Prior to the reformation, which marked the triumph of cæsarism over feudalism, there was, no doubt, much barbarism in Christian Europe; but there was no absolutism. A reminiscence of Græco-Roman imperialism remained, indeed, and was cherished by the civil lawers or legists, whose maxim was, *Quod placuit principi, legis habet vigorem;* but absolutism never succeeded in getting itself established. The German emperors, especially the Hohenstaufen, cæsarists in principle as well as in name, attempted to revive the Roman empire, but did

not succeed. Power was divided. There were free cities and *communes* that governed themselves as veritable republics under the guardianship, nominal rather than real, of a suzerain. The royal power was limited by the great vassals of the crown, and the authority of these in turn was limited by the lesser nobles, by the estates, and by the laws, and usages which had the force of laws. What characterizes the middle ages is the spirit of liberty. Few men in our time have better understood the middle ages, save as to the action of the church, than Sir Walter Scott, who, if a romancer, was also something more and better. He says in his *Anne of Geierstein:*

"We may remind our readers, that in all feudalized countries (that is to say, in almost all Europe during the middle ages,) an *ardent spirit of liberty* pervaded the constitution; and the only fault that could be found was, that the privileges and freedom for which the great vassals contended did not sufficiently descend to the lower orders of society, or extend protection to those most likely to need it. The two first ranks in the state, the nobles and the clergy, enjoyed high and important privileges, and even the third estate, or citizens, had this immunity in peculiar, that no new duties, customs, or taxes of any kind could be exacted from them save by their own consent."

The fault Sir Walter mentions was not peculiar to the middle ages, and is not less in European countries to-day than it was then. The representatives or delegates of the cities and *communes* constituted the third estate, and sat in the assembly of the estates as early as the reign of Philip the Fair. If the rural population were not represented in the estates, they were not forgotten. The church had received that population as either slaves or serfs. She had succeeded in completely abolishing slavery in all continental Europe before the fifteenth century, and had made much progress toward putting an end to serfage. The enslaved populations were emancipated in nearly all Catholic Europe before the reformation, and in the early part of the seventeenth century the French courts decided that "a slave could not breathe the air of France." The maxim of the English courts was plagiarized from the French judges. There may be a question whether the European peasant has gained much since the middle ages; whether his increased wants have not more than kept pace with his increased means of supply; and as for protection, they who most need it never find it under any political *régime.* The most cruel

and heartless landlords could not have been more cruel and heartless than are your cotton-mills and mammoth moneyed corporations, especially when Mammon was not exclusively worshipped.

But be all this as it may, this much is certain: that during the feudal ages there was, under the influence and untiring exertions of the pope and the monastic orders, a constant social amelioration of society going on, and the whole tendency of those marvellous ages, so little understood, and so foully belied, was toward the establishment in every nation of a well ordered liberty under the safeguard of the church, and of Christian or christianized traditions and manners. The fifteenth century came, and brought with it not only the revival of pagan literature, but of pagan politics, which gave to the secular order a predominance over the spiritual, as we have explained in previous articles. The unhappy residence of the popes at Avignon, that "Babylonian captivity," as it has been called, and the great schism of the West, which followed it, in the fourteenth century, had served much to diminish the splendor and to weaken the political power of the papacy. This, coupled with the secular development of the age, and the pagan revival, gave a chance for cæsarism to raise its head, and for the sovereigns to declare themselves absolute, and responsible to God alone for their exercise of power. The feudal constitution of Europe was crushed, and the pagan empire took its place. Not only the emperor and the mightiest kings, but the pettiest sovereign duke or count became a Cæsar in his own dominions.

At this moment, just as cæsarism was on the point of winning the victory, the reformation broke out, not in behalf of the old liberties, but to help abolish them and secure to Cæsar his triumph. So far from founding or even aiding liberty, it interrupted its progress, and gave the movement in its favor, which had from the seventh century been going on, a false and fatal direction. The originators of the reformation may have been simply heterodox theologians; but they could not sustain themselves without the aid of the princes, and that aid could be obtained only by ministering to their love of power, and submitting to their supremacy alike in spirituals and temporals. The princes that favored the reformation became each in his own principality absolute prince and *pontifex maximus*. The prince protects the reformers, and uses his civil and military power to crush

their enemies, and to extirpate the old religion from his dominions. Dependent on him, and sustained only as upheld by him, the reformation was impotent to restrain his arbitrary power. The reformed religion, like gentilism, of which it was in fact only a revival, assumed at once the character of a national religion; and the reformed church was absorbed by the state, and became one of its functions, an instrument of police, which must always be the fate of a national religion.

But the Protestant nations not only helped on cæsarism, which was the spirit of the age, but they gave up or were despoiled of their old liberties, which they had long possessed and enjoyed under the benign protection of the church. England saw her parliament practically annulled, and the prince governing, under Henry VIII., his daughter Elizabeth, and the first two Stuarts, as a Byzantine basileus or an oriental despot; and it cost her a century of insurrections, revolutions, and civil wars to recover some portion of the political and civil freedom of which the reformation had despoiled her. Even the Abbé Martin seems to forget that from 1639 to 1746 England was in a state as unsettled as France has been since 1789. She has not even yet recovered all her old liberties. She has, indeed, depressed the crown to exalt the aristocracy of birth or wealth, and is now entering upon a fearful struggle between aristocracy and democracy, most likely to end either in reviving the pagan republic, or in establishing once more the absolute authority of the crown.

The author very justly maintains that Protestantism has not created liberty, and that it has arrested or falsified it. He recalls that,

"At the breaking out of Protestantism slavery had entirely disappeared, and serfage or villanage, the transition state from slavery to complete liberty, was gradually disappearing, and giving place to free labor and domestic servants. The third estate was everywhere constituted, and nowhere had it more life and vigor than in the neighborhood of the churches and monasteries. This emancipation was the work of the Catholic Church, and never had a more signal service been rendered to liberty. The basis of all liberties, I say not of modern but of Christian liberties, was laid.

"Impartial history testifies that Protestantism has not accelerated this movement in behalf of liberty, but has arrested it. A few facts, gathered at random from the immense number that might be adduced, will sufficiently prove this assertion.

"'In Denmark,' says Berthold, 'the peasant was reduced to serfage as a dog.' The nobility profited by the reform, not only to appropriate to themselves the greater part of the goods of the church, but also the free goods of the peasant.

"'The *corvées*,' says Allen, the best historian of Denmark, 'were arbitrarily multiplied; the peasants were treated as serfs. It happened frequently that the children of the preachers and sacristans themselves were reduced to serfage.' In 1804—mark the late date—personal liberty was granted for the first time to twenty thousand families of serfs. Sweden and Norway fared no better. In Mecklenberg, the oppression of the peasants, who had no one to defend their rights since they had lost the effective and vigilant protection of the Catholic clergy, followed immediately the triumph of the reformation. At the diet of 1607, they were declared simple tenants at will—*colons*—who must yield up to the landlords, on their demand, even the lands which they had possessed from time immemorial. Their personal liberty was suppressed by the ordinances of 1633, 1648, and 1654. They sought to escape from this intolerable servitude by flight. The emigration was large. But the severest punishments, the lash, chains, even death, could not arrest it, nor prevent the depopulation of the fields. The lot of those miserable creatures hardly differed from that of negro slaves. The only difference was, that the masters were prohibited from separating families, and selling the members to the highest bidder at public auction; but they eluded it by trading off their serfs as horses and cows. Serfage was abolished in Mecklenburg only in 1820.

"The introduction of the reformation into Pomerania gave birth there to all the horrors of slavery. The ordinance of 1616 decreed that all peasants are serfs without any rights. . . . The ministers were required to denounce the fugitive serf from the pulpit. People are astonished to-day at the emigration from Germany, which nearly doubles that from Ireland. May not the cause be found in that old state of things, which, though recently abolished, has left but too many traces of its existence?

"A single fact will enable us to judge of the magnitude of the evil in Prussia. Under Frederick II., the contemporary and friend of Voltaire, who labored so energetically to make of his infant kingdom an immense barrack, the soldiers themselves, the support and instrument of his power, when discharged, returned to the common lot of serfs, after having fought his battles and won his victories. They were subjected anew to their landlords; and not only they, but also their wives, their widows, and their children, even though born in a state of freedom. . . . .

"Calvinism has not produced so sad results of the same kind. Less hierarchical in its nature than Lutheranism, and having taken its rise in Geneva, a free state, it has preserved something of its original constitution. Thus it has prevailed generally in countries organized under a republican form; in France, even, it aspired to a federation. But the liberty it has found, rather than created, it turns into an odious tyranny.

It has, above all, no respect for individual liberty. The system which Calvin established at Geneva was even surpassed by that of John Knox in Scotland. The ecclesiastical domination over the faithful, and the inquisition into all their doings, were frightful. Every detail of private life could be brought before the presbyterial *forum;* nobody could feel himself safe. Espionage and domestic accusation were the soul of the system. The secrets of the family were scrutinized and inventoried and the terrible arm of excommunication struck without relaxation and without mercy. Woe to him who fell under its blows; for him there was no social right. Will it be believed? The Puritans of England, who, to escape oppression and death, free, and masters of a virgin territory, became only the more rigorous, and their communities in North America were even more exclusive and tyrannical than those of their brethren in Europe."

The author is too lenient toward Calvinism. It had, indeed, no partiality for monarchy, and just as little for democracy. What it aimed at was an aristocracy of the saints. Only those in grace could be freemen or exercise any authority in the community. The church was composed of the saints alone; and hence, in the colony of Massachusetts, only church members could be selectmen, or magistrates, or vote in elections. Church members had equal rights indeed; but those who were not church members had no rights at all, political, civil, or individual, and no social standing. The church members themselves covenanted to watch over each other, which meant, practically, that every member was to act as a spy upon every other member; and hence that cautiousness in speech, that fear of a *mouchard* in every neighbor, and that obsequiousness to public opinion, which marks not a few of the descendants of the New England Puritans even to this day. The rights of man in relation to his brother man were undreamed of, and for individual liberty there was no respect whatever. The individual was subject to the congregation, ruled by the pastor and elders or deacons, themselves ruled by two or three venerable spinsters. Calvinism sought, in fact, to govern society, as a monastery, *minus* celibacy, by converting the evangelical counsels into inflexible laws, and without the assistance of the grace of vocation. We shall never forget the odious tyranny to which Calvinism subjected our own boyhood. Life for us was stern, gloomy, hedged round with terror. We did not dare listen to the joyous song of a bird, nor to inhale the fragrance of an opening flower. Whatever gave pleasure was to be eschewed, and the most

innocent pleasures were to be accounted deadly sins. We cannot even now, in our old age, think of our own Calvinistic childhood, which was by no means exceptional, without a shudder.

Thus far the author has spoken of individual liberty, which is the most essential of all, and without which civil and political liberty is a vain mockery. He asserts and proves, as we have seen, that Protestantism has not given to individual liberty a new development, but has arrested it. Well, was it more favorable to political liberty? We have answered this question already, but we cannot forbear citing the author's own reply:

"At the epoch of the outbreak of Protestantism, Christendom was advancing with rapid strides toward the practice of the largest liberty. For centuries the Italian republics had pushed liberty almost to license. They were, no doubt, often disorderly and turbulent; but they were full of sap, overflowing with life and activity, which availed for Italy a power and a glory which she seeks in vain from a factitious unity. Switzerland, by the energy of her patriotism and the wisdom of her government, won the admiration of the whole world. Flanders and the northern provinces of Spain watched with jealous susceptibility over their proud and noble independence; England had her *Magna Charta*, the basis of the strong constitution which has given her security in the midst of modern political and social convulsions; the cities and *communes* of France and Germany administered freely their own affairs, as small republics under the guardianship, often more nominal than real, of some few suzerains. The guilds or corporations of the mechanics and tradesmen enjoyed rights the most extended. Power was nowhere despotic, and, though not restrained by scientific and uniform rules, it encountered everywhere a counterpoise to its authority and obstacles to its arbitrary will. Christian monarchy, that creation of the church, unknown in antiquity, approached maturity, and there was room to hope that it would found liberty without opening the door to license, and without having recourse to that enormous centralization which has only too often become a necessity. Catholic theology, always liberal, in the true sense of the word, inclined more to the rights of the people than to the rights of the sovereign. It knew not yet that divine right of kings as it was understood under Louis XIV., a diminutive pagan cæsarism, which, as we shall show further on, held more strictly than is commonly believed from the principles which the renaissance and Protestantism caused to prevail."

We remark here that the *Christian monarchy* of which the learned abbé speaks existed in the doctrines of the theologians and in the efforts of the church, rather than in the

actual order. There were Christian monarchs or sovereigns, like St. Henry of Germany, St. Ferdinand of Spain, and St. Louis of France; but there was nowhere, that we have been able to discover, a *Christian* monarchy. The feudal monarchy was of barbarian origin, and was a development of the chief of the tribe or clan. Side by side with this, constantly struggling with it for the mastership of society, was Græco-Roman imperialism, or briefly, cæsarism, favored by the whole body of the legists, and always opposed by the church, though not always by churchmen become statesmen and courtiers. This pagan cæsarism, which concentrates in the hands of the prince absolute authority in both temporals and spirituals, survived the fall of the Roman empire, and never for a moment ceased to struggle to recover the mastership; and it was it that was in question in the long struggle between the pope and the emperor. Defeated in the last of the Hohenstaufen, it revived in every petty prince in Christendom. It drove the popes from Rome into the exile of Avignon, and caused the great western schism. Still, the church was for a time able to prevent its complete success. But in 1453 came the taking of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, the dispersion of the Greek scholars through the West; and the revival of pagan politics and literature served to reënforce cæsarism, to weaken the influence of the church, and to give birth to the Protestant reformation—at bottom nothing more nor less than a revival of the pagan order, against which the church from her birth had struggled.

The movement of which Protestantism was one of the the results dates from a period before Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin, from the revival in the fifteenth century, and the successful struggle of cæsarism against feudalism and the church. Protestantism may have prevented the development of a Christian monarchy; but it was itself a child of cæsarism. The movement against feudalism, and for the concentration of power in the hands of the monarch, as well as for great centralized states, preceded the birth of Protestantism. Louis XI. in France, Maximilian I. in Germany, Henry VII. of England, Cardinal Ximenes in Spain, and the Medici in Italy, all labored for the centralization of power, and paved the way for the revival and triumph in their respective countries of pagan cæsarism. The Abbé Martin's statements are correct only in case we count Protestantism, under its social and political aspects, as the con-

tinuation and development of the movement in behalf of cæsarism, or the centralization of power, and against the liberties secured by feudalism.

We are no admirers of feudalism; but we hold it better than the Græco-Roman imperialism it supplanted, or the absolute monarchy which succeeded it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of which Bossuet was a conspicuous defender. The reformation aided the movement in behalf of cæsarism, by bringing to its support an open rebellion against the papal authority and the faith of the church, and secured it the victory. Cæsarism followed it immediately, not only in the nations that accepted the new religion, but also, to a great extent, in the nations that remained Catholic. On the first point the author asks:

"Who does not know that Lutheranism depended solely on the princes and nobles to overcome and despoil the church, and to triumph over the resistance of the people? Through gratitude, and through necessity, it surrendered itself and the people to the discretionary authority of the princes. In all countries where it became predominant, absolute power prevailed.

"As the result of the revolution of 1661, Frederic III. of Denmark and his successors were declared absolute monarchs. The royal law of 1665 attests that the king was required to take no oath, was under no obligation whatever; but had plenary authority to do whatever he pleased. In Sweden, the violent and surreptitious establishment of Protestantism was done in the interest of royalty and nobility, and, moreover, raised up an antagonism between these two powers which produced a series of revolutions in that country unrivalled in any other European state. But royalty finally triumphed. The estates, in 1680, declared that the king is bound to no form of government. In 1682, they declared it an absurdity to pretend that he was bound by statutes and ordinances to consult, before acting, the estates; whence it follows that the will of the king was the supreme law. 'After that,' says Gejer, the classic historian of Sweden, 'all was interpreted to the advantage of the omnipotence of one alone. The estates were no longer called the estates of the realm, but the estates of his majesty. In 1693, the unlimited absolutism of royalty became the law; the king was free to govern according to his good pleasure, without any responsibility.'

"It would be too long to follow the introduction of the same *régime* as the consequence of the reformation into the several states and principalities of Germany, in Mecklenburg, Pomerania, the duchies of Hanover and Brunswick, Brandenburg and Saxony. Everywhere the introduction of the new religion was followed by an augmentation of the power of the prince and nobles and everywhere the prince finally succeeded in absorbing the power of the nobility. Prussia affords us a

striking example of this result. Under the reign of the Elector Frederic William, from 1640 to 1688, the arbitrary and absolute power of the prince was developed according to a regular plan. The general diet after 1665 ceased to be convoked. Crushing taxes were imposed without the consent and against the protests of the estates, and collected by the military; and so heavy were they, that multitudes of peasants, despoiled of their goods, were driven to brigandage for a living. A great number sought refuge in Poland, and nobles even deserted a country that devoured their children. Lands which were taxed beyond the value of their produce were abandoned, and suffered to run to waste. The country was oppressed by an unprecedented tyranny. Prussia, according to the expression of Stenzel, was in the way of becoming one of those Asiatic countries in which despotism stifles the growth of whatever is beautiful or noble."

We have already spoken of the effects of the introduction of Protestantism into England and Scotland. Calvinism, the author considers, caused less grave and less durable damage to liberty; yet it was not less tyrannical by nature, only it was less monarchical. "At Geneva it confiscated all the ancient franchises to the profit of the oligarchy it established, and it was not owing to it that in Holland the stadtholder did not become absolute." Protestant historians are perfectly well aware of these facts, and from time to time they concede them; and yet the best of them continue to assert the impudent falsehood, that Protestantism has created and sustained modern liberty, individual, civil, and political—not, indeed, because it has done so, but because they think it would have been much in its favor if it had.

The other point, that Protestantism is in great measure responsible for the establishment or partial establishment of the pagan monarchy, or cæsarism, in Catholic nations, we have shown in our previous articles on the work before us; yet we cite the following from the author:

"It is not simply in countries in which it triumphed that the Protestant reformation has given to liberty a retrograde movement; it has reacted in a most fatal, though generally in an imperceptible manner on Catholic governments themselves. It was, at its first appearance, a terrible temptation to the princes and sovereigns of Europe. It broke that firm independence of the Catholic clergy which had for so many ages repressed the tyrannical aspirations of secular governments; it gave up the rich spoils of the church to them, reversed their parts, and after having placed the priest, the representative of heaven, at the mercy of the powers of earth, it constituted the prince the master and director of consciences. What could be more seductive? An obstacle to overcome,

almost a yoke to break, independence to conquer, vast riches to appropriate, the empire of souls to place by the side of the empire of bodies. the ideal of a power veritably sovereign; is it not the dream of every man who feels himself at the head of a nation? Princes and sovereigns yielded to the temptation. They were, besides, already prepared for it, by the received theories of legists or civil lawyers inherited from the pagan state; by the ideas propagated by the renaissance and by the Machiavellian lessons then taught in all the courts of Europe; and if all did not accept Protestantism, it was far less due to their personal repulsion than to the decided opposition of their people. But the new ideal of power germinated in their minds. On the other hand, the church, weakened and her very existence threatened, saw herself reduced to the necessity of relying on them for support against the armed violence of the reformation. She must purchase their protection, and could do it only at the expense of her independence. In various places she abandoned to them the nomination of bishops and the collation of benefices, giving by this sacrifice, rigorously exacted by circumstances, and by this abandonment of her rights, which afterward proved so fatal, a sufficient satisfaction for the moment to the secret reason which inclined them to Protestantism. She loosened a prey to them. in order not to be devoured herself. Their hunger thus appeased, they consented to sustain her, but without having a common cause with her.

"Profiting adroitly by their position, the sovereigns passed rapidly from the part of defenders of the church to that of guardians and masters, and while respecting the essence of the spiritual power, they labored to subordinate the church and the exercise of her authority to the surveillance of the state. Not content with excluding all control of the church over their own acts, all interventions of the spiritual authority in civil and political affairs, they sought, after the example of the Protestant princes, to penetrate the interior of the church, and make themselves pontiffs; and if we cannot say that they completely succeeded, we cannot any more say that they wholly failed. What is certain is, that thenceforward they ceased to find any serious obstacle in the Catholic clergy or their chief to their designs, and that the legists, imbued with the maxims of the Roman law, and for a long time hostile to the church, coming to their aid, absolute royalty, without much difficulty, prevailed. The indirect influence of Protestantism was there.

"Even the Catholic clergy themselves contributed to this fatal evolution. Whether moved by gratitude, by a monarchical impulse, or, in fine, by necessity, they accepted, at least in the civil and political order, the new pretensions, and acknowledged the new rights of those sovereigns who, in espousing the Catholic religion, had saved it from the greatest danger it had as yet run. Influenced by the tendency of the times, Catholic theologians, especially in France, deserted the highways of the political theology of the middle ages, and proclaimed not only the divine origin of power, but the divine right of the king, his de-

pendence on God alone, and the passive obedience of the people. The idea of the Christian monarchy was perverted, and in Catholic as in Protestant countries it inclined to cæsarism. The church was the principal victim of this political transformation, she was all but smothered in the cruel embraces of Catholic monarchs, when God himself delivered her by the blow which was intended to extinguish her—the French revolution. When that revolution broke out, the work of the renaissance and of the reformation seemed accomplished. Except in England, Holland, and some microscopic Swiss republics, Catholic for the most part, absolutism reigned everywhere. Is it not, then, the strangest falsification of history to attribute to Protestantism the initiation of modern liberty?"

Unhappily, Protestants will pay little heed to the fact that the loss of liberty in Catholic nations was due either to Protestantism or to the movement of which Protestantism was simply a development. There can be no reasonable doubt that but for Protestantism the church would have been able to check and roll back the powerful movement for the revival of cæsarism, which had commenced in the fifteenth century, and have prevented the growth of absolute monarchy in a single Catholic state. The Protestant rebellion so weakened her external power, and detached from her so large a portion of the populations of Europe, that she was no longer able to restrain the absolutist tendencies of all European sovereigns. The sovereigns themselves, almost without exception, were inclined to the movement—were, in fact, its chief supporters; and if they did not all join it, it was because they were held back by their people, whose faith in the old religion was too strong to be given up at the pleasure of their princes, not because they had personally any devotion or attachment to her faith. The French court and most of the higher French nobility openly or secretly favored Protestantism till the conversion of Henry IV.; and even that monarch had formed a league with the Protestant princes, and was preparing for a war against the Catholic powers of Euope, at the very moment he was assassinated. His policy was adopted and carried out under his successors by Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin, who repressed Protestantism in the interior, but supported it everywhere else. That France remained Catholic, was owing to the concessions made by the pope to her sovereigns, and to the firmness of the French people under the lead of the noble Guises, so calumniated by almost all modern French writers.

Yet the abbé expresses himself too strongly. The triumph of absolutism was never so complete in Catholic as in Protestant nations. In Protestant nations, the sovereigns united both the political and the spiritual powers, as under Greek and Roman gentilism, absorbed the church, and made religion a function of the state. In Catholic nations, although royalty interfered beyond measure in ecclesiastical affairs, the two powers remained distinct, and the church retained, at least in principle, her autonomy, however circumscribed and circumvented in its exercise. This is evident from the concordats she conceded to the sovereigns, and the diplomatic relations of Catholic powers with the Holy See. Throughout all her humiliations, the church asserted and maintained, in principle, her independence. In all Protestant countries, the state legislated for the Protestant church; it nowhere treated with it as a separate power, and held, and could hold, no diplomatic relations with it. In all Protestant nations, the church became national and local; but in all Catholic nations she continued to be catholic, and was always and everywhere some restraint on the absolute power of the sovereign, as both Louis XIV. and Napoleon I. learned by experience, and hence their discreditable quarrels with the Holy See, and the imprisonment of the Holy Father by the latter. Lord Molesworth remarked in 1792, as cited by the author from Döllinger's *Church and Churches*, that, "in the Roman Catholic religion, with the supreme head of the church at Rome, there is a principle of opposition to unlimited political power. It is not the same with the Lutheran [he might have added the Anglican] clergy, who depend on the crown as their spiritual and temporal superior." This principle opposes the unlimited power of the people no less than of the monarch, and hence the sects all agree, now that the age tends to democratic absolutism, in opposing the church in the name of the people; for Protestantism has the same absolutist instincts always and everywhere.

The author, we think, exaggerates the adoption by the Catholic clergy, even in France, of absolutism in politics. Bossuet, who was a French courtier as well as a Catholic bishop, as tutor to the dauphin, went, no doubt, as far in asserting the divine right of kings, and passive obedience, as the Anglican divines under the Stuarts; and some of the clergy, yielding to court influence and the spirit of the age, followed him; but the noble Fénelon, in no respect his in-

ferior as a theologian, differed from him and held, with the great body of Catholic theologians in all ages, that power is a trust for the public good, and that kings are responsible to the nation for their exercise of it. It was his anti-absolutist doctrine, not his few inaccurate expressions on the doctrine of pure love, in his *Maxims of the Saints*, that caused him to be stripped of his charges at court, and exiled to his diocese of Cambray. Nor is it true, as the abbé insinuates, that the pope sanctioned the absolutist doctrines which prevailed in France or elsewhere in the seventeenth century. The four articles, dictated by the government, slightly modified by Bossuet, and accepted by a small minority of the French bishops, which contain the very essence of absolutism, were no sooner published by order of the king, and commanded to be taught in all the theological seminaries, and to be conformed to by all the professors and clergy of the realm, than the pope condemned them, annulled the order of the king, and finally compelled him to withdraw it, or at least to pledge himself that he would do so. The pope never failed to assert, and as far as he could, to cause to be respected, the rights of the church—that is to say, the rights of God, which are the only solid basis of the rights of man.

Every theologian knows that, prior to the rise of Protestantism, and even for a considerable time afterward, Catholic political theology bears no trace of the absolutism taught by Bossuet, and which he had borrowed from contemporary Protestantism. It is worthy of remark that nowhere were the first acts of the French revolution hailed with more joy than at Rome with the pope and cardinals, and it found no warmer, firmer, or more disinterested supporters than the French clergy as a body, whose representatives were the first to join the *tiers état*. Afterward, when the revolution run into horrible excesses, put forth doctrines subversive of all religion, and even of society itself, assumed the right to legislate on spiritual matters, and showed that it only transferred absolutism from the king to the mob, there was undoubtedly a reaction against it in the minds of the pope and clergy, as there was in the minds of all men not incapable of profiting by experience, and who could not prefer license to orderly liberty. The salvation of religion and society made it the duty of the church to sustain with all her power the sovereigns in their efforts to repress the revolutionary spirit, and to restore and maintain social peace and order.

It is this fact, stripped of its reasons, and its real nature misunderstood or misrepresented, that has given rise to the pretence that the church opposes, while Protestantism, which is leagued, if not identical, with the revolution, favors liberty. Protestants never, that we are aware, put forth any pretence of the sort prior to 1792. Up to the moment of this reaction against the French revolution, the contrary charge had been made, and the church condemned for being hostile to the rights of sovereigns, and it was in reply to the speech of Cardinal Duperron, in the states-general in France in 1614, in favor of the rights of the nation and the church against the irresponsibility of the crown, that James I. of England wrote his *Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings*. History as written by Protestants is composed of disjointed facts, misplaced and misrepresented, whenever it is not pure invention.

The author is not quite exact in saying absolutism reigned everywhere at the breaking out of the French revolution, except in England, Holland, and the Swiss cantons. The United States had won their independence and adopted their federal constitution before that event, and certainly the American republic was not founded on the principle of the omnipotence of the state or the people. It revived neither pagan imperialism nor pagan republicanism, and was in its fundamental principles more nearly a Christian republic than the world had hitherto seen.

It would seem, as the great mass of the American people were Protestants, and the more influential portion of them intensely Protestant, of the Calvinistic type, that the American republic should be held as an exception to the assertion that Protestantism resulted everywhere in the establishment of absolutism. But it is in reality no exception. It had no existence at the epoch of the reformation, and Protestantism had no hand in founding it. It was founded by Providence, and the principles which form its basis were derived by the English colonists, not from Protestantism, but from the old constitution of England in Catholic times, and which, though suppressed by the ruling classes, never ceased to live in the traditions of the English people. The revolution in the seventeenth century in England was the struggle of the English people to recover their old rights, of which Protestant royalty and nobility had deprived them. Royalty and nobility did not emigrate; they remained at home, and there were in the Anglo-American colonies no

materials from which either could be constructed. The great principle of the Puritans, that the church is independent of the state and superior to it, or that the state has no authority to legislate in religious matters, not even in non-essentials, was a Catholic principle, for which the popes, in their long struggles with the secular power, had uniformly contended. It is the vital principle of liberty; for it interposes the rights of God, represented by the church, as the limits of the rights of the state. The Puritans had asserted this principle in their own defence against the Protestant king and parliament of England, which assumed plenary authority in spirituals as well as in temporals. It was not Protestantism that developed this great principle of all just liberty, and opposed to all absolutism; it was the old Catholic principle, always and everywhere asserted by the Catholic Church.

But taking the Bible, especially the Old Testament, interpreted by a fallible authority, as this criterion of the rights of God, as represented by their Puritan church, the Puritans failed not in asserting, but in applying the principle, and established, in practice, as we have seen, a most odious tyranny. They misapplied the principle, which can be rightly applied only by the Catholic Church. Their Protestantism misled them, and perverted the truth they retained, as was universally the case with Calvinists. It is easy to see now why Protestantism deserves no credit for founding American liberty. It was not of Protestant origin, and we may add Protestantism is busy at work to destroy it, or at least shows itself impotent to sustain it.

The true basis of American liberty is in the assertion of the rights of God, represented by the church, or by religion, as bounding or limiting the power of the state, whether imperial or popular. But under Protestant influences, the rights of God are resolved into the rights of man, and the Christian republic becomes simply a humanitarian republic, which can offer no solid foundation for liberty of any sort. The rights of man are no more sacred and inviolable than the rights of the prince or the state. It is only when the rights of man are resolved into the rights of God in and over man, that they are sacred and inviolable, or inalienable. But the American people have ceased so to resolve them, if, indeed, they ever did it, and recognize no more ultimate basis for liberty than humanity itself. If, as many of them do, they insist on religion as necessary to the maintenance

of liberty, it is only as an external prop or support, not as its logical basis, or root, out of which it grows, and from which it derives all its sap and vigor.

No humanitarian republic is or can be a free republic, because, though it recognizes the people as the state, and establishes universal suffrage and eligibility, it has nothing but humanity, nothing above the people, to limit or restrict their power as the state. The people are humanity in the concrete, and a humanitarian republic therefore simply transfers the absolutism from the monarch to the people, and substitutes democratic cæsarism for monarchical cæsarism, the pagan republic for the pagan empire. Absolutism is absolutism, whether predicated of the one or of the many. We in the United States are rapidly losing sight of the Catholic principle retained by the Puritans, and rushing into democratic absolutism; we assert the omnipotence of the will of the people, and treat constitutions as simply self-imposed restrictions, which bind no longer than the people will. Demagogues, politicians, and statesmen tell the people that their will is supreme; and vainly would he seek their suffrages who should deny it. The opposition to the extension of the church in this country grows precisely out of the well-known fact, that she does not emanate from the people, is not subject to the will of the people, and would restrict their omnipotence—an opposition that proves that she, not Protestantism, is the defender of liberty. Certainly, if she were to become predominant here, she would soon put an end to the absolutism of the state, sustained by all our leading journals, and reëstablish the Christian republic, in place of the humanitarian or pagan republic, to which we are pushed by the Protestant spirit of the age, the veritable *Weltgeist*, or prince of this world, as all Protestant movements amply prove.

The abbé shows a strict alliance between contemporary Protestantism and the revolution, or revolutionary movements in all European nations. With these revolutionary movements we have the authority of the chief magistrate of the Union for saying the American people generally sympathize. We lend, at least, all our moral support to these movements wherever we see them. They owe their origin, in fact, to Protestantism; and, so far at least as they are confined to Catholic nations, are fomented and encouraged by Protestant emissaries and Protestant associations and contributions; yet these movements are, under the name

of liberty, purely humanitarian, and their success would simply substitute the absolutism of the people for the absolutism of the monarch—democratic cæsarism, or rather, demagogic cæsarism, for imperial cæsarism. In the sixteenth century, the sovereigns embraced or inclined to the reformation, because it removed the restraints that the church imposed on their absolute power and arbitrary will; demagogues and revolutionists in the nineteenth century glorify it, because it removes all restrictions on the will of the people as the state. In each case the church is opposed to it, and for the same reason, because she asserts the rights of God as the basis of the rights of man; and, as their divinely constituted guardian and representative, interposes them as a limit to the absolute power of the state, whether monarchical or democratic, the only security possible for the reign of justice, of just laws, and therefore of real liberty, individual, civil, and political.

There is no doubt that Protestantism, since the culmination of monarchical absolutism in the seventeenth century, has agitated for the revival of what it calls liberty, but what we call the humanitarian or pagan republic. The people moved by it have, no doubt, supposed they were marching toward real liberty; but they have nowhere gained it, and have only removed the day of its acquisition. Under its influence we have smothered the principle of liberty, and lost most of the guaranties which Providence gave us in the outset. We have lost not only the principle of liberty, but also its correlative, the principle of authority; and have no basis for either freedom or government, for the basis of neither can be found in humanity. Great Britain, to a certain extent has popularized her administration; but through all her changes of dynasties and constitutions, she has never ceased to assert the omnipotence of the state as the state, supreme in spirituals as in temporals. On the continent, the revolution, attempted in the name of humanity, has nowhere founded liberty. Its momentary success in France from 1792 to 1795, inclusive, is universally recognized as the reign of terror, when religion was suppressed and virtue was punished as a crime. France, after a century of revolutions, is not as free to-day as she was even under her old monarchical institutions. The French are just now trying anew the experiment of parliamentary government which the Anglo-maniacs consider only as another name for liberty; but whether the experiment succeeds or fails, lib-

erty will gain nothing; for the parliamentary government is as absolute as the personal government of Napoleon III., and most likely will have even less regard for the rights of God. The one no more than the other will recognize the spiritual power as a restriction on the power of the temporal.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the spirit of the age was for the revival of pagan imperialism; the spirit of the age is now, and has been, since the middle of the last century, the pagan republic; but there is just as little liberty under the one as under the other, or, if any difference, there is less under pagan republicanism than under pagan imperialism; for the Roman empire was really an improvement on the Roman republic. Under the one the monarch is the state; under the other the people or the ruling classes are the state; and under both the state is alike supreme, and acknowledges no limit to its power. The republican party is now, here and in all Europe, as hostile to the church as were the sovereigns in the sixteenth century, and for the same reason. The party knows perfectly well that it is impossible for her to approve any form of absolutism in the state. Having decided that the humanitarian republic it seeks to establish, and to which the spirit of the age tends, is liberty, it holds, and public opinion sustains it, that its success depends on sweeping her away, and destroying all religion that does not emanate from the people, or that claims to be a power independent of the state, and authorized to declare the law for the people instead of receiving it from them. Because she resists the madmen of this party, and seeks to save herself and society, they denounce her as opposed to liberty, as the upholder of despots and despotism, as at war with the spirit of the age, and the bitter enemy of modern civilization. "If," said the accusers of our Lord to the Roman procurator, "thou lettest this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend." "If," said the reformers of the sixteenth century, "thou sparest the pope or the church, thou art no friend, but a traitor to the king;" "if," say their children in this nineteenth century, "thou upholdest the church, thou art no friend, but a traitor to the sovereign people, and false to liberty;" and the nineteenth century believeth them. We disbelieve them and believe the Lord, who hath bought us with his own precious blood and made us free.

These madmen are animated and carried away by the spirit of the age, and suppose all the time that they are bat-

tling for liberty against its most dangerous enemies. They carry the people with them, and induce them to crucify their God as a malefactor. What is to restrain them? The strong arm of power? That were only to establish the reign of force. Reason? What can reason do with madmen, or against the multitude blinded by false lights and moved onward by an unreasoning passion? The intelligence of the age? Are they not carried away by the age, and is it not from the very madness of the age that they need to be saved? When the very light in the age is darkness, how great must be its darkness! It is only a power that draws its light from a source of light above the light of the age, and acts with a wisdom and strength that is above the people, above the world, that can restrain them and convert them into freemen.

If there is any truth in history, or any reliance to be placed on the inductions of reason, the author has amply proved, in opposition to the pretensions of Protestants and revolutionists, that society under the direction and influences of the Catholic Church marches steadily toward a true and regular liberty—a liberty which is grounded in the rights of God, and therefore secures the rights of man. He has also proved conclusively, as experience itself proves, that just in proportion as the influence of the church in society is weakened, liberty disappears, and absolutism, either of king or people, advances. He has shown that the reformation, instead of founding or aiding liberty, has interrupted it, and prevented the development of the germs of free institutions deposited in society during the much-maligned and little-understood middle ages. Protestantism, even when, as in our own time, professing to labor for liberty, only falsifies it, and interposes insurmountable obstacles to its realization. Protestantism—and we have studied it both as a Protestant and as a Catholic—is made up of false pretences; is, as Carlyle would say, an unveracity, and loses not only the eternal world, but also this present world. The divine thought after which the universe is created and governed is one and catholic, and the law by which we gain our final end is one and holy; and without obedience to it there is no good possible, here or hereafter, either for society or for the individual. The present can have its fulfilment only in the future, and the temporal has its origin, medium, and end only in the spiritual, and finds its true support as its true law, only in the one eternal law of God,

the universal lawgiver, declared and applied by the one holy Catholic Church, which he himself has instituted for that purpose, and which is his body, which he animates, and in which he dwells, teaches, and governs.

It remains for us to consider the respective relations of Protestantism and Catholicity to religious liberty, or the freedom of conscience.

LAST ARTICLE.

In our third article on the Abbé Martin's exhaustive work on the future of Protestantism and Catholicity, we disposed of the pretension of Protestants that the reformation created and has sustained civil and political liberty in modern society. We proceed in the present and concluding article to dispose, as far as we can, of the pretension that it has founded and sustained religious liberty, or the freedom of conscience.

No fact is more certain than that the reformation has the credit with non-Catholics, if not even with some half-instructed Catholics themselves, of having originated religious liberty and vindicated the freedom of the mind. Here as elsewhere the formula of the age, or what claims to be enlightened in it, is Protestantism and freedom, or Catholicity and slavery; and it is to its *prestige* of having founded and sustained religious liberty that Protestantism owes its chief ability in our times to carry on its war against the church. Protestantism, like all false religions or systems, having no foundation in truth and no vital energy of its own, lives and prospers only by availing itself of the so-called spirit of the age, or by appealing to the dominant public opinion of the time and the place. In the sixteenth century, the age tended to the revival of imperialism or cæsarism, and Protestantism favored monarchical absolutism, and drew from it its life, its force, and its sustenance.

The spirit or dominant tendency of our age, dating from the middle of the last century, has been and is the revival of the pagan republic, or, as we call it, democratic cæsarism, which asserts for the people as the state the supremacy which under imperialism is asserted for the emperor. Protestantism lives and sustains itself now only by appealing to and representing this tendency, as we may see in the contemporary objections to the church, that she is "behind the age," "does not conform to the age," "is hostile to the

spirit of the age," "opposed to the spirit of the nineteenth century."

Every age, nation, or community understands by liberty, freedom to follow unrestrained its own dominant tendency; we might say, its own dominant passion. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, liberty meant the freedom of temporal sovereigns to govern according to their own good pleasure, unrestrained by the church, on the one hand, and estates, diets, or parliaments, on the other. Liberty means now the freedom of the people, unrestrained either by the rights of God or the rights of princes, to govern as they or the demagogues, their masters, judge proper. Hence, liberty, as the world understands it, varies in its meaning from age to age, and from nation to nation, and, indeed, from individual to individual. Whatever favors or is in accordance with the dominant tendency or passion of an age, nation, community, or individual, favors or is in accordance with liberty; and whatever opposes or impedes it is opposed to liberty—is civil, political, or spiritual despotism. Protestantism never resists, but always follows, and encourages and echoes the dominant tendency of the age or nation. The church, having a life and force derived from a source independent of the age or nation, seeks not support in that dominant passion or tendency, does not yield or conform to it, but labors unceasingly and with all her energy to conform it to herself. Hence, in the estimation of the world, Protestantism is always on the side of liberty, and the church on the side of despotism and slavery.

The attempt to deny this, and to prove that the church favors liberty in this sense, is perfectly idle; and to seek to modify her position and action, so as to force her to accept and conform to the dominant or popular tendency or passion of the age or nation, is to mistake her essential character and office, and to forget that her precise mission is to govern all men and nations, kings and peoples, sovereigns and subjects, and to conform them to the invariable and inflexible law of God, which she is appointed by God himself to declare and apply, and therefore to resist with all her might every passion or tendency of every age, nation, community, or individual, whenever and wherever it deviates from that law of which she is the guardian and judge. The church is instituted, as every Catholic who understands his religion believes, to guard and defend the rights of God on earth against any and every enemy, at all

times and in all places. She therefore does not and cannot accept, or in any degree favor, liberty in the Protestant sense of liberty, and if liberty in that sense be the true sense, the Protestant pretension cannot be successfully denied.

But we have already seen that liberty in the Protestant sense is no liberty at all, or a liberty that in the civil and political order is identified with cæsarism—the absolutism of the prince in a monarchy, the absolutism of the people or of the ruling majority for the time in a democracy. This last might be inferred from the ostracism practised in democratic Athens, and is asserted and defended, or rather taken for granted, by almost the entire secular press in democratic America. The most conservative politicians among us recognize the justice of no restrictions on the will of the people but such as are imposed by written constitutions, and which a majority or three-fourths of the voters may alter at will and as they will. It is the boast of our popular orators and writers that there are with us no restrictions on the absolute will of the people but such as the people voluntarily impose on themselves, which, as self-imposed, are simply no restrictions at all. It is evident, then, if liberty means any thing, if there is any difference between liberty and despotism, freedom and slavery, the Protestant understanding of liberty is not the true one.

Nor is the Protestant understanding of *religious* liberty a whit more true. We have found that the basis or principle of all civil and political liberty is religious liberty, or the freedom and independence of religion—that is to say, the spiritual order; but from the point of view of Protestantism there is no religion, no spiritual order, to be free and independent. According to Protestantism, religion is a function, not a substantive existence or an objective reality. It is, as we have seen, on Protestant principles, a function of the state, of the community, or of the individual, and whatever liberty there may be in the case, must be predicated of one or another of these, not of religion, or the spiritual order. With Protestants the freedom and independence of religion or the spiritual order would be an absurdity, for it is precisely that which they began by protesting against. It is of the very essence of Protestantism to deny and make unrelenting war on the freedom and independence of religion, and the only liberty in the case it can assert is the freedom of the state, the community, or the in-

dividual from religion as law, and the right of one or another of them to adopt or reject any religion, or none at all as they choose, which is irreligious or infidel, not religious liberty.

Protestantism, under its most favorable aspect, is not, even in the estimation of Protestants themselves, religion, or a religion; but the view of religion which the reformers took, or which men take or may take of religion. At best it is not the objective truth or reality, but a human doctrine or theory of it, which has no existence out of the mind that forms or entertains it. Hence, Protestants assert, as their cardinal doctrine, justification by faith alone; and which faith is not the truth, but the mind's view of it. Hence, too, they deny that the sacraments are efficacious *ex opere operato*, and maintain that, if efficacious, at all, they are so *ex opere suscipientis*. They reject the Real Presence as a "fond imagination," and make every thing in religion depend on the subjective faith, conviction, or persuasion of the recipient. The church they recognize or assert is no living organism, no kingdom of God on earth, founded to teach and govern all men and nations in all things pertaining to eternal life or the spiritual end of man, but a simple association of individuals, with no life or authority except what it derives from the individuals associated, and which is not hers, but theirs.

Some Protestants go so far as to doubt or deny that there is any truth or reality independent of the mind, and hold that a man is himself his own teacher and his own lawgiver; but all concede, nay, maintain, that what is known or is present to the mind is never the reality, the truth, or the divine law itself, but the mind's own representation of it. Hence their Protestantism is not something fixed and invariable, the same in all times and places, but varies as the mind of Protestants itself varies, or as their views, convictions, or feelings change, and they change ever with the spirit of the age or country. One of their gravest objections to the church was, in the sixteenth century, that she had altered the faith; and in the nineteenth century is, that she does not alter it, that she remains inflexibly the same, and absolutely refuses to change her faith to suit the times. They hold their own faith and doctrine alterable at will, and are continually changing it. Evidently, then, they do not hold it to be the truth; for truth never changes: nor to be the law of God, which they are bound to obey; for if the law

of God is alterable at all, it can be so only by God himself, never by man, any body of men, or any creature of God. There is no Protestant ignorant or conceited enough to maintain the contrary.

This fact that Protestantism is a theory, a doctrine, or a view of religion, not the objective reality itself, not the recognition and assertion of the rights of God, but a human view or theory of them, proves sufficiently that it is incompatible with the assertion of *religious* liberty. All it can do is to assert the right or liberty of the state to adopt and ordain any view of religion it may take; of the community to form and enforce its own views, convictions, or opinions; or of the individual to make a religion to suit himself; or to go without any religion at all, as he pleases. In none of these cases is there any religious liberty; and in them all religion is subjected to a purely human authority—the authority of the state, of the community, or of the individual, one as human as another. Protestantism is really in its very nature and essence an earnest and solemn protest against religious liberty, and for it to assert the freedom and independence of religion, or the spiritual order—that is, of religion as law to which all men are bound to conform—would be to commit suicide. Even the supremacy of the spiritual order, which our old Puritans asserted, was only the assertion of the authority of their interpretation of the written word against the divine authority to interpret it claimed by the church, and against the human authority of the civil magistrate claimed by Anglicanism, from which they separated, while it subjected it to the congregation, the brotherhood, or to the ministers and elders, no more spiritual than the civil magistrate himself.

In the beginning Protestantism made religion in nearly all Protestant nations a function of the state, as it is still in Great Britain, Prussia, the several Protestant German states, in Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland. The progress of events, and the changes of opinion, have produced a revolt among Protestant nations against this order, and Protestants now make, or are struggling to make, it a function of the community or the sect, and the more advanced party of them demand that it be made a function of the individual. This advanced party do not demand the freedom of religion, but the freedom of the individual from all religious restraints, from all obligations of obedience to any religious law, and indeed of

any law at all, except the law he imposes on himself. Dr. Bellows, of this city, a champion of this party, proves that it is not the freedom of religion, nor the freedom of the individual to be of any religion he chooses; for he denies that he is free to be a Catholic, though he is free to be any thing else. He tells Catholics they are only tolerated; and threatens them with extermination by the sword, if they dare claim equal rights with Protestants, and insist on having their proportion of the public schools under their own control, or on not being taxed to support schools to which they cannot with a good conscience send their children.

Evidently, then, the pretension that the reformation has founded or favored religious liberty is as worthless as we have seen is the pretension that it has founded or favored civil and political liberty. It has, on the contrary, uniformly opposed it, and asserted only the liberty of its contradiction. To assert the liberty of the state, the people, or the individual, to control religion, or to assert the liberty of infidelity or no-religion, surely is not to assert the liberty of religion. Protestantism yields always to the spirit of the age, and asserts the right of that spirit to modify, alter, or subject religion to itself. There can be no religious liberty where religion must follow the spirit of the times, and change as it changes. Religion, if any thing, is the supreme law of conscience, and conscience is a mere name if obliged to obey as its supreme law the dominant passion or tendency of the age or nation. The freedom of conscience is not in the emancipation of conscience from all law, for that were its destruction; but in its being subjected to no law but the law of God, promulgated by divine authority, and declared to the understanding by God himself, or a court appointed, enlightened, and assisted by the Holy Spirit. Under Protestantism there is and can be no freedom of conscience; for under it conscience is either destroyed by being subjected to no law, or enslaved by being subjected to another law than the law of God.

This conclusion, which we obtain by a simple analysis of Protestantism, is confirmed by all the facts in the case. Every student of the history of Protestantism knows that the reformers never made the pretension now put forth in their name. No man was ever further from proposing the emancipation of the mind from what is called spiritual thraldom than Martin Luther, and no man ever showed less respect for human reason. His aim was to emancipate the

church from the authority of the pope; and in this laudable work he engaged the princes of the empire, who were ready to assist him, because in doing so they could also emancipate themselves, make themselves pontiffs as well as princes, and enrich themselves with the spoils of the church. But Luther substituted for the authority of the pope and councils that of the written word, as amended and interpreted by himself. He never recognized the so-called right of private judgment, and never asserted the right of every man to interpret the written word for himself. The Bible as interpreted by himself, Martin Luther, was to be taken in all cases as the supreme and only authority, and he would tolerate no dissent from his interpretation. He assumed for himself more than papal authority; for he confessedly assumed authority to alter the written word, which assuredly no pope ever did. He never admitted any right of dissent from his dicta, and wherever he could, he suppressed it by the strong arm of power.

John Calvin was not more tolerant, as the burning of Michael Servetus over a slow fire made of green wood, and his pamphlet justifying the burning of heretics, amply prove. Henry VIII. of England put to death Catholics and Lollards, beheaded Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, because they refused to take the oath of the royal supremacy, except with the qualification, "as far as the law of Christ permits." In Sweden, the peasants were entrapped into the support of the reformation by the infamous Gustavus Vasa, under pretence of recovering and reëstablishing the national independence; and after the prince had regained by their aid his throne and been crowned king, were massacred by thousands because they wished still to adhere to the Catholic Church, and resisted its abolition. In Geneva, Protestantism gained a footing in much the same way. Protestants came from Berne and other places to assist the citizens in a political rebellion against their prince, who was also their bishop, and afterward drove out the Catholics who could not be forced to accept the reformation.

We need not pursue the history of the establishment of Protestantism, which is written in blood. Suffice it to say, that in no country was the reformation introduced but by the aid of the civil power, and in no state in which it gained the mastery did it fail to be established as the religion of the state, and to obtain the suppression by force or civil pains and penalties of the old religion, and of all forms even of

Protestant dissent. The state religion was bound hand and foot, and could move only by permission of the temporal sovereign, and no other religion was tolerated. We all know the penal laws against Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland, reënacted with additional severity under William and Mary, almost in the eighteenth century. James II., it is equally well known, lost the crown of his three kingdoms by an edict of toleration, which, as it tolerated Catholics, was denounced as an act of outrageous tyranny. The penal laws against Catholics were adopted by the Episcopalian colony of Virginia, and the Puritan colony of Massachusetts made it an offence punishable with banishment from the colony for a citizen to harbor a Catholic priest for a single night, or to give him a single meal of victuals. It was only in 1788 that the Presbyterian Assembly of the United States expunged from their confession of faith the article which declares it the duty of the civil magistrate to extirpate heretics and idolaters—an article still retained by their brethren in Scotland, and by the United Presbyterians in this country.

Indeed, toleration is quite a recent discovery. Old John Cotton the first minister of Boston, took care to warn his hearers or readers that he did not defend "that *devil's* doctrine, toleration." Toleration to a limited extent first began to be practised among Protestants on the acquisition of provinces whose religion was different from that of the state making the acquisition. The example was followed of the pagan Romans, who tolerated the national religion of every conquered, tributary, or allied nation, though they tolerated no religion which was not national, and for three hundred years martyred Christians because their religion was not national, but catholic. It is only since Voltaire and the encyclopædists preached toleration as the most effective weapon in their arsenal, as they supposed, against Christianity, or the beginnings of the French revolution of 1789, that Protestants have taken up the strain, professed toleration, and claimed to be, and, in the face and eyes of all history, always to have been, the champions of religious liberty and the freedom of conscience. It was not till 1829 that the very imperfect Catholic Relief Bill passed in the British parliament, and the complete disestablishment of Congregationalism as the state religion in Massachusetts did not take place till 1835, though dissenters had for some time previous been tolerated.

Yet in no Protestant state has complete liberty been extended to Catholics. The French revolution with its high-flown phrases of liberty, equality, brotherhood, and religious freedom, suppressed the Catholic religion, and imprisoned, deported, or massacred the bishops and priests who would not abandon it for the civil church it ordained. We ourselves, though very young at the time, remember the exultation of our Protestant neighbors when the first Napoleon dragged the venerable and saintly Pius VII. from his throne and held him a prisoner, first at Savona, and afterward at Fontainebleau. "Babylon is fallen," they cried; "the man-child has slain the beast with seven heads and ten horns." The revolutions, ostensibly social and political, which have been going on in the Catholic nations of Europe, and are still in process, and which everywhere are hostile to the church, have the warm sympathy of Protestants of every nation, and in Italy and Spain have been aided and abetted by Protestant associations and contributions, as part and parcel of the Protestant programme for the abolition of the papacy and the destruction of our holy religion.

Protestants now tolerate Protestant dissenters, and allow Jews and infidels equal rights with themselves; but they find great difficulty in regarding any outrage on the freedom of the church as an outrage on religious liberty. She is catholic, not national, over all nations, and subject to none; therefore no nation should tolerate her. Even in this country Protestants very reluctantly suffer her presence, and the liberal Dr. Bellows, a Protestant of Protestants, warns, as we have seen, Catholics not to attempt to act as if they stood on an equality with Protestants. It is only a few years since the whole country was agitated by the Know-Nothing movement, got up in secret lodges, for the purpose, if not of outlawing or banishing Catholics, at least of depriving them of civil and political citizenship. The movement professed to be a movement in part against naturalizing persons of foreign birth, but really for the exclusion of such persons only in so far as they were Catholics. The controversy now raging on the school question proves that Protestants are very far from feeling that Catholics have equal rights with themselves, or that the Catholic conscience is entitled to any respect or consideration from the state. Public opinion proscribes us, and no Catholic could be chosen to represent a purely Protestant constituency in any

legislative body, if known to be such and to be devoted to his religion. Our only protection, under God, is the fact that we have votes which the leaders of all parties want; yet there is a movement now going on for female suffrage, which, if successful, will, it is hoped, swamp our votes by bringing to the polls swarms of fanatical women, the creatures of fanatical preachers, together with other swarms of infidel, lewd, or shameless women, who detest Catholic marriage and wish to be relieved of its restraints, as well as of their duties as mothers. This may turn the scale against us; for Catholic women have too much delicacy, and too much of that retiring modesty that becomes the sex, to be seen at the polls.

But the imperfect toleration practised by Protestants is by no means due to their Protestantism, but to their growing indifference to religion, and to the conviction of Protestant and non-Catholic governments, that their supremacy over the spiritual order is so well established, their victory so complete, that all danger of its renewing the struggle to bring them again under its law is past. Let come what may, the spiritual order can never regain its former supremacy, or Cæsar tremble again at the bar of Peter. Cæsar fancies that he has shorn the church so completely of her catholicity, except as an empty name, and so fully subjected her to his own or the national authority, that he has no longer any need to be intolerant. Why not, indeed, amnesty the poor Catholics, who can no longer be dangerous to the national sovereign, or interfere with the policy of the state?

For ourselves, we do not pretend that the church is or ever has been tolerant. She is undeniably intolerant in her own order, as the law, as truth is intolerant, though she does not necessarily require the state to be intolerant. She certainly is opposed to what the nineteenth century calls religious liberty, which, we have seen, is simply the liberty of infidelity or irreligion. She does not teach views or opinions, but presents the independent truth, the reality itself; proclaims, declares, and applies the law of God, always and everywhere one and the same. She cannot, then, while faithful to her trust, allow the truth to be denied without censuring those who knowingly deny it, or the law to be disobeyed without condemning those who disobey it. But always and everywhere does the church assert, and, as far as she can, maintain the full and perfect liberty of

religion, the entire freedom and independence of the spiritual order, to be itself and to act according to its own laws—that is, religious liberty in her sense, and, if the words mean any thing, religious liberty in its only true and legitimate sense.

The nineteenth century may not be able to understand it, or, if understanding it, to accept it; yet it is true that the spiritual is the superior, and the law of the temporal. The supremacy belongs in all things of right to God, represented on earth by the church or the spiritual order. The temporal has no rights, no legitimacy save as subordinated to the spiritual—that is, to the end for which man is created and exists. The end for which all creatures are made and exist is not temporal, but spiritual and eternal; for it is God himself who is the final cause as well as the first cause of creation. The end, or God as final cause, prescribes the law which all men must obey, or fail of attaining their end, which is their supreme good. This law all men and nations, kings and peoples, sovereigns and subjects, are alike bound to obey; it is for all men, for states and empires, no less than for individuals, the supreme law, the law and the only law that binds the conscience.

Now, religion is this law, and includes all that it commands to be done, all that it forbids to be done, and all the means and conditions of its fulfilment. The church, as all Catholics hold, is the embodiment of this law, and is therefore in her very nature and constitution teleological. She speaks always and everywhere with the authority of God, as the final cause of creation, and therefore her words are law, her commands are the commands of God. Christ, who is God as well as man, is her personality, and therefore she lives, teaches, and governs in him, and he in her. This being so, it is clear that religious liberty must consist in the unrestrained freedom and independence of the church to teach and govern all men and nations, princes and people, rulers and ruled, in all things enjoined by the teleological law of man's existence, and therefore in the recognition and maintenance for the church of that very supreme authority which the popes have always claimed, and against which the reformation protested, and which secular princes are generally disposed to resist when it crosses their pride, their policy, their ambition, or their love of power. Manifestly, then, religious liberty and Protestantism are mutually antagonistic, each warring against the other.

The church asserts and vindicates the rights of God in the government of men, and hence is she called the kingdom of God on earth. The rights of God are the foundation of all human rights; for man cannot create or originate rights, since he is a creature, not his own, and belongs, all he is and all he has, to his Creator. God's rights being perfect and absolute, extend to all his creatures; and he has therefore the right that no one of his creatures oppress or wrong another, and that justice be done alike by all men to all men. We can wrong no man, deprive no man of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, without violating the rights of God and offending our Maker. "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of my brethren, ye did it unto me." Hence, the church in asserting and vindicating the rights of God, asserts and protects in the fullest manner possible the so-called inalienable rights of man, opposes with divine authority all tyranny, all despotism, all arbitrary power, all wrong, all oppression, every species of slavery, and asserts the fullest liberty, political, civil, social, and individual, that is possible without confounding liberty with license. The liberty she sustains is true liberty; for it is that of which our Lord speaks when he says, "If the Son makes you free, ye shall be free indeed." The church keeps, guards, declares, and applies the divine law, of which human laws must be transcripts in order to have the force or vigor of laws. Man has in his own right no power to legislate for man, and the state can rightfully govern only by virtue of authority from God. Hence, St. Paul says, *Non est potestas nisi a Deo.* "There is no power except from God."

The church in asserting the supremacy of the law of God or of the spiritual order, asserts not only religious liberty, but all true liberty, civil, political, social, and individual; and we have seen that liberty, the basis and condition of civilization, was steadily advancing in all these respects during the middle ages till interrupted by the revival of paganism in the fifteenth century and the outbreak of Protestantism in the sixteenth. The reformation did not emancipate society from spiritual thraldom, but raised it up in revolt against legitimate authority, and deprived it of all protection, on the one hand, against arbitrary power, and, on the other, against anarchy and unbounded lawlessness, as the experience of more than three centuries has proved. There is not a government in Europe that is not daily conspired

against, and it requires five millions of armed soldiers even in time of peace to maintain internal order, and give some little security to property and life. To pretend that the authority of the church, as the organ of the spiritual order, is despotic, is to use words without understanding their meaning. Her authority is only that of the law of God, and she uses it only to maintain the rights of God, the basis and condition of the rights of individuals and of society. Man's rights, whether social or individual, civil or political, are the rights of God in and over man, and they can be maintained only by maintaining the rights of God, or, what is the same thing, the authority of the church of God in the government of human affairs. Atheism is the denial of liberty, as also is pantheism, which denies God as creator.

There is no liberty where there is no authority competent to assert and maintain it, or where there is no authority derived from God, who only hath dominion. The men who seek to get rid of authority as the condition of asserting liberty are bereft of reason, and more in need of physic and good regimen than of argument. Liberty is not in being exempt from obedience, but in being held to obey only the rightful or legitimate authority. God's right to govern his creatures is full and perfect, and any authority he delegates or authorizes to be exercised in his name, is legitimate, and in no sense abridges or interferes with liberty—unless by liberty you mean license—but is the sole condition of its maintenance. God's dominion over man is absolute, but is not despotic or tyrannical, since it is only his absolute right. The authority of the church, however extended it may be, and she is the judge of its extent and its limitations, as the court is the judge of its own jurisdiction, is not despotic, tyrannical, or oppressive, because it is the authority of God exercised through her.

The pretension of Protestants that Protestantism favors liberty, and the church despotism, is based on the supposition that authority negatives liberty and liberty negatives authority, that whatever is given to the one is taken from the other; a supposition we refuted some time since, in an article entitled *An Imaginary Contradiction*,* and need detain us no longer at present. Just or legitimate authority, founded on the rights of God, and instituted to assert and

*Vol. III, p 391.

maintain them in human affairs, confirms and protects liberty instead of impairing it.

Yet there is no doubt that the church condemns liberty in the sense of the reformation, and especially in that of the nineteenth century. Protestantism denies infallibility to the church and assumes it for the age, for the state, for public opinion—that is, for the world. The most shocking blasphemy in its eyes is to assert that the age is fallible and cannot be relied on as a safe or sure guide. We differ from the Protestant; we attribute infallibility to the church, and deny it to the age, even though the age be this enlightened nineteenth century. We do not believe it is always wise or prudent to suffer one's self to be carried away by the dominant tendency or passion of this or any other age. It is characteristic of every age to fix upon one special object or class of objects, and to pursue them with an exclusiveness and a concentrated passion and energy that render them practically evil, even though good when taken in their place and wisely pursued. Even maternal affection becomes evil and destructive, if not guided or restrained by wisdom and prudence. Philanthropy is a noble sentiment; yet men and women in our own age, carried away, dazzled, and blinded by it, only produce evils they would avoid, defeat the very good they would effect. The spirit of our age is that of the production, accumulation, and possession of material goods. Material goods in their proper measure and place are needed; but when their production and accumulation become with an individual or an age an engrossing passion that excludes the spiritual and the eternal, they are evil, and lead only to ruin, both spiritual and material, as daily experience proves.

The church, then, instituted to teach the truth and to secure obedience to the law of God, directed always by her divine ideal, is forced to resist always and everywhere the age, that is, the world, instead of following its spirit, and to labor for its correction, not for its encouragement. Hence always is there more or less opposition between the church and what is called the spirit of the age, and their mutual concordance is never to be looked for so long as the world stands. Hence the church in this world is the church militant, and her normal life one of never-ending struggle with the world—spirit of the age, *der Weltgeist*—the flesh, and the devil. It is only by this struggle that she makes conquests for heaven, and prevents civil governments from de-

generating into intolerable tyrannies, and society from lapsing into pagan darkness and superstition.

We have, we think, sufficiently disposed of the Protestant pretension, and if any of our readers think we have not fully done it, we refer them to the work before us. There is no doubt that the boldness, not to say impudence, with which the Protestant pretension is urged, and the support it receives from the rationalistic journalism and literature which form contemporary public opinion in Catholic nations, coupled with the general ignorance of history and the shortness of men's memories, accounts for the chief success of Protestant missions in unmaking Catholics, which, though very limited, is yet much greater than it is pleasant to think. Yet gradually the truth will find its way to the public; even Protestants themselves will by and by tell it, piece by piece, as they are now doing. They have already refuted many of the falsehoods and calumnies they began by inventing and publishing against the church, and in due time they will refute the rest.

The abbé shows very clearly that the toleration now accepted and to some extent practised, and the liberty now allowed to the various sects, will most likely have a disastrous effect on the future of Protestantism. It must sooner or later, he thinks, lead to the demolition of the Protestant national establishments. National churches cannot coexist with unlimited freedom of dissent. The English church must soon follow the fate of the Anglican church in Ireland. Its disestablishment is only a question of time. So it will be before long in all Protestant nations that have a national church. The doctrine of toleration and freedom for all sects and opinions not only tends to produce indifference to dogmatic theology, but is itself a result of that indifference; and indifference to dogmatic truth is a more formidable enemy to deal with than out-and-out disbelief or positive infidelity. A soul breathing forth threatenings, and filled with rage against Christians, can be converted, and become Paul the apostle and doctor of the gentiles; but the conversion of a Gallio, who cares for none of these things, is a rare event.

With the several sects, doctrinal differences are daily becoming matters of less and less importance. Who hears now of controversies between Calvinists and Arminians? Even the New School and the Old School Presbyterians, though separated by grave dogmatic differences, unite

and form one and the same ecclesiastical body; Presbyterians and Methodists work together in harmony; Orthodox Congregationalists show signs of fraternizing with Unitarians, and Unitarians fraternize with radicals who reject the very name of Christian, and can hardly be said to believe even in God. One need not any longer believe any thing, except that Catholicity is a gross superstition, and the church a spiritual despotism, the grand enemy of the human race, in order to be a good and acceptable Protestant. A certain inward sentiment, emotion, or affection, which even a pantheist or an atheist may experience, suffices. The dread presence of the church, hatred of Catholicity, the zeal inspired by party attachment, and the hope of finally arriving at some solid footing, may keep up appearances for some time to come; the eloquence, the polished manners, the personal influence, and the demagogic arts and address of the preacher may continue for a while to fill a few fashionable meeting-houses; but when success depends on the personal character and address of the minister, as is rapidly becoming the fact in all Protestant sects, we may take it for granted that Protestantism has seen its best days, is going the way of all the earth, and soon the place that has known it shall know it no more for ever.

Protestantism, with all deference to our author, who pronounces it imperishable, we venture to say, has well-nigh run its course. It began by divorcing the church from the papacy and subjecting religion to the national authority, subordinating the spiritual to the temporal, the priest to the magistrate, the representative of heaven to the representative of earth. It constituted the national sovereign the supreme head and governor, the *pontifex maximus*, after the manner of the gentiles, of the national religion, or the national church, and punished dissent as treason against the prince. It was at first, and for over two centuries, bitterly intolerant, especially against Catholics, whom it persecuted with a refined cruelty which recalled, if it did not surpass, that practised by paganism on Christians in the martyr ages.

Tired of persecution, or finding it impotent to prevent dissent, Protestantism tried after a while its hand at civil toleration. The state tolerated, to a greater or less extent, at first only Protestant dissenters from the established church; but at last, though with many restrictions, and with the sword ever suspended over their heads, even

Catholics themselves. From civil toleration, from ceasing to cut the throats and confiscate the goods of Catholics, and of Protestant recusants, it is passing now to theological tolerance, or what it calls complete religious liberty, though as yet only its advanced-guard have reached it.

The state, unless in the American republic, does not, indeed, disclaim its supremacy over the church; but it leaves religion to take care of itself, as a thing beneath the notice of the civil magistrate, so long as it abstains from interfering with state policy or meddling with politics. To-day Protestantism divorces, or seeks to divorce, the church from the state, as it began by divorcing both her and the state from the papacy; it divorces religion from the church and from morality, Christianity from Christ, faith from dogma, piety from reason, and it resolves into an affection of man's emotional or sentimental nature. We find persons calling themselves Christians who do not believe in Christ, or regard him as a myth, and godly, who do not even believe in God. We have men, and women, too, who demand the disruption of the marriage tie in the name of morality, and free love in the name of purity. Words lose their meaning. The churl is called liberal, things bitter are called sweet, and things profane are called holy. Not many years since, there was published in England, and republished here, an earnest and ingenious poem, designed to rehabilitate Satan, and chanting his merits as man's noblest, best and truest friend. In the mean time, every thing regarded as religion loses its hold on the new generations; moral corruption of all sorts in public, domestic, and private life is making fearful progress throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, the mainstay of Protestantism; and society seems tottering on the verge of dissolution. Such is the career Protestantism has run, is running, or by the merciless logic to which it is subjected, will be forced to run. What hope, then, can Protestants have for its future?

As to the future of Catholicity, we are under no apprehensions. We know that never can the church be in this world the church triumphant, and that she and the world will always be in a state of mutual hostility; but the hostility can never harm her, though it may cause the spiritual ruin of the individuals and nations that war against her. The Protestant world have for over three hundred years been trying to get on without her, and have succeeded but indifferently. Sensible and earnest-minded men among

Protestants themselves boldly pronounce that the experiment has failed, which most Protestants inwardly feel, and sadly deplore; but like the poor man in Balzac's novel, who has spent his own patrimony, his wife's dower, the portion of his daughter, with all he could borrow, beg, or steal, and reduced his wife, his children and himself to utter destitution, in the *recherche de l'absolu*, they are buoyed up by the feeling that they are just a-going to succeed. But even this feeling cannot last always. Hope too long "deferred maketh the heart sick." It may be long yet, and many souls for whom Christ has died be lost, before the nations that have apostatized learn wisdom enough to abandon the delusive hope and turn again to Him whom they have rejected, or look again, weeping, on the face of Him whom they have crucified. But the church will stand, whether they return or not; for she is founded on a rock that cannot be shaken, on the eternal truth of God, that cannot fail.

The Protestant experiment has demonstrated, beyond question that the very things in the Catholic Church which are most offensive to this age, and for which it wages unrelenting war against her, are precisely those things it most needs for its own protection and safety. It needs, first of all, the Catholic Church—nay, the papacy itself—to declare and apply the law of God to states and empires, to sovereigns and subjects, kings and peoples, that politics may no longer be divorced from religion, but be rendered subsidiary to the spiritual, the eternal end of man, for which both individuals and society exist and civil governments are instituted. It needs the church to declare and enforce the law, by such means as she judges proper, that should govern the relation of the sexes; to hallow and protect marriage, the basis of the family, as the family is of society, that great sacrament or mysterious union, typical of the union of Christ with the church, which is indissoluble; to take charge of education, and to train up, or cause to be trained up, the young in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, or in the way they should go, that when old they shall not depart from it; to teach maidens modesty and reserve, and wives and mothers due submission to their husbands and proper care of their children; to assert and protect the rights of women; to train them to be contented to be women, and not to aspire to be men, or to usurp the functions of men, and to bid them stay at home and not be gadding abroad, running over the country and spouting non-

sense, free love, infidelity, impiety, and blasphemy, at suffrage conventions, and other gatherings, at which it is a shame for a woman to open her mouth, or even to be present; and, most of all, to exercise a vigilant censorship over ideas, whether vented in books, journals, or lectures, and to keep from the public those which tend to mislead the mind or corrupt the heart as a prudent father strives to keep them from his children.

The age needs for this the *Catholic* Church. A national church cannot do it; far less can the sects do it. These all depend on the public opinion of the age, the nation, or the sect, and have no power to withstand that opinion. This is perhaps better understood here than elsewhere. The sects, being creatures of opinion, have no power to control it, and their tendency is invariably to seize upon every opinion, excitement, or movement that is, or is likely to be, popular, and help it on as the means of swelling, when it is at flood-tide, their own respective numbers. A national church has undoubtedly more stability, and is not so easily wrested from its moorings. But it has only the stability of the government that ordains it, and the most absolute government must sooner or later yield to the force of opinion. Opinion has disestablished and disendowed the state church in Ireland, and will, as is most likely, do it ere long in both England and Scotland. The Protestant sects have no alternative; they must either yield to the dominant opinion, tendency, or passion of the times and move on with it, or be swept away by it.

It is only a church truly catholic, that depends on no nation, that extends to all, and is over all, that derives not its being or strength from the opinion of courts or of peoples, but rests on God for her being, her law, and her support, that can maintain her integrity, or have the courage to stand before an age or a nation, denounce its errors, and condemn its dominant passion or tendency, or that would be heeded, if she did. It was only the visible head of the Catholic Church, the vicar of Christ, that could perform the heroic act of publishing in this century the syllabus; and if, as we are confident they have, the prelates assembled in the Council of the Vatican have some share of the courage of their chief, their decrees will not only draw the attention of the world anew to the church, but go far to prove to apostate nations and truculent governments that she takes counsel of God, not of the weakness and timidity of men.

A few more such acts as the publication of the syllabus and the convocation of the council now sitting at Rome, joined to the manifest failure of Protestantism, will serve to open the eyes of the people, disabuse non-Catholics of the delusions under which they are led away to their own destruction. The very freedom, though false in principle, which is suffered in Protestant nations, while it removes all restraints from infidelity, immorality, and blasphemy, aids the victory of the church over her enemies. It ruins them by suffering them to run into all manner of excesses; but she can use it without danger and with advantage where there are minds to be convinced or hearts to be won; for she can abide the freest examination, the most rigid investigation and scrutiny, while the indwelling Holy Ghost cannot fail to protect her from all error on either side. The present delusions of the loud-boasting nineteenth century must give way before her as she once more stands forth in her true light, and her present enemies be vanquished.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

[From the Catholic World for April, 1870.]

THE number of *The Christian World*, the organ of the American and Foreign Christian Union, for February last is entirely taken up with the school question, and professes to give "a carefully digested summary of the views and reasonings of all parties to the controversy." The views and reasonings of the Catholic party are not misstated, but are very inadequately presented; those of the other parties are given more fully, and, we presume, as correctly and as authoritatively as possible. The number does not dispose of the subject; but furnishes us a fitting occasion to make some observations which will at least set forth correctly our views of the school question as Catholics and American citizens.

It is to the credit of the American people that they have, at least the Calvinistic portion of them, from the earliest colonial times, taken a deep interest in the education of the young, and made considerable sacrifices to secure it. The

American Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who were the only original settlers of the eastern and middle colonies, have from the first taken the lead in education, and founded, sustained, and conducted most of our institutions of learning. The Episcopalians, following the Anglican Church, have never taken much interest in the education of the people, having been chiefly solicitous about the higher class of schools and seminaries. The Baptists and Methodists have, until recently, been quite indifferent to education. They have now some respectable schools; but the writer of this was accustomed in his youth to hear both Baptists and Methodists preach against college-bred parsons, and a *larned* ministry. In those states which had as colonies proprietary governments, and in which the Episcopalians, Baptists, and Methodists have predominated, universal education has been, and still is, more or less neglected. Even the Presbyterians, while they have insisted on a learned ministry and the education of the easy classes, have not insisted so earnestly on the education of the children of all classes as have the Congregationalists; and, indeed, it is hardly too much to say that our present system of common schools at the public expense owes its origin to Congregationalists and the influence they have exerted. The system, whatever may be thought of it, has undeniably had a religious, not a secular origin.

The system originated in New England; strictly speaking, in Massachusetts. As originally established in Massachusetts, it was simply a system of parochial schools. The parish and the town were coincident, and the schools of the several school-districts into which the parish was divided were supported by a tax on the population and property of the town, levied according to the grand list or state assessment roll. The parish, at its annual town meeting, voted the amount of money it would raise for schools during the ensuing year, which was collected by the town collector, and expended under the direction of a school committee chosen at the same meeting. Substantially the same system was adopted and followed in New Hampshire and Connecticut. In Vermont, the towns were divided or divisible, under a general law, into school-districts, and each school-district decided for itself the amount of money it would raise for its school, and the mode of raising it. It might raise it by tax levied on the property of the district, or, as it was said, on "the grand list," or *per capita* on the scholars attending and according to the length

of their attendance. In this latter method, which was gen erally followed, only those who used the schools were taxed to support them. This latter method was, in its essential features, adopted in all, or nearly all, the other states that had a common-school system established by law. In Rhode Island and most of the southern states, the inhabitants were left to their own discretion, to have schools or not as they saw proper, and those who wanted them founded and supported them at their own expense. In none of the states, however, was there developed at first a system of free public schools supported either by a school fund or by a general tax on property levied by the state, though Massachusetts contained such a system in germ.

Gradually, from the proceeds of public lands, from lots of land reserved in each township, especially in the new states, for common schools, and from various other sources, several of the states accumulated a school fund, the income of which, in some instances, sufficed, or nearly sufficed, for the support of free public schools for all the children in the state. This gave a new impulse to the movement for free schools and universal education, or schools founded and supported for all the children of the state at the public expense in whole or in part, either from the income of the school fund or by a public tax. This is not yet carried out universally, but is that to which public sentiment in all the states is tending; and now that slavery is abolished, and the necessity of educating the freedmen is deeply felt, there can be little doubt that it will soon become the policy of every state in the Union.

The schools were originally founded by a religious people for a religious end, not by seculars for a purely secular end. The people at so early a day had not advanced so far as they have now, and did not dream of divorcing secular education from religion. The schools were intended to give both religious and secular education in their natural union, and there was no thought of the feasibility of separating what God had joined together. The Bible was read as a class-book, the catechism was taught as a regular school-exercise, and the pastor of the parish visited the schools and instructed them in religion as often as he saw proper. Indeed, he was, it might be said, *ex officio* the superintendent of the parish schools; and whether he was chosen as committeeman or not, his voice was all potent in the management of the school, in the selection of studies, and in the appoint-

ment and dismissal of teachers. The superiority in a religious and moral point of view to the schools as now developed may be seen by contrasting the present moral and religious state of New England with what it was then.

The religion, as we Catholics hold, was defective, and even false; but the principle on which the schools were founded was sound, and worked well in the beginning, did no injustice to any one, and violated no conscience; for Congregationalism was the established religion, and the people were all Congregationalists. Even where there was no established religion and different denominations obtained, conscience was respected; for the character of the school, as well as the religion taught in it, was determined by the inhabitants of the school district, and nobody was obliged to send his children to it, and those only who did send were taxed for its support.

But in none of the states is there now an established religion, and in all there are a great variety of denominations all invested with equal rights before the state. It is obvious, then, the Massachusetts system cannot in any of them be adopted or continued, and the other system of taxing only those who use the schools cannot be maintained, if the schools are to be supported from the income of public funds, or by a public tax levied alike on the whole population of the district, town, municipality, or state. Here commences the difficulty—and a grave one it is, too—which has as yet received no practical solution, and which the legislatures of the several states are now called upon to solve.

Hitherto the attempt has been made to meet the difficulty by excluding from the public schools what the state calls sectarianism—that is, whatever is distinctive of any particular denomination or peculiar to it—and allowing to be introduced only what is common to all, or, as it is called, "our common Christianity." This would, perhaps, meet the difficulty, if the several denominations were only different varieties of Protestantism. The several Protestant denominations differ from one another only in details or particulars, which can easily be supplied at home in the family, or in the Sunday-school. But this solution is impracticable where the division is not one between Protestant sects only, but between Catholics and Protestants. The difference between Catholics and Protestants is not a difference in details or particulars only, but a difference in principle. Catholicity must be taught as a whole, in its unity and its integrity, or

it is not taught at all. It must everywhere be all or nothing. It is not a simple theory of truth or a collection of doctrines; it is an organism, a living body, living and operating from its own central life, and is necessarily one and indivisible, and cannot have any thing in common with any other body. To exclude from the schools all that is distinctive or peculiar in Catholicity, is simply to exclude Catholicity itself, and to make the schools either purely Protestant or purely secular, and therefore hostile to our religion, and such as we cannot in conscience support.

Yet this is the system adopted, and while the law enables non-Catholics to use the public schools with the approbation of their consciences, it excludes the children of Catholics, unless their parents are willing to violate their Catholic conscience, to neglect their duty as fathers and mothers, and expose their children to the danger of losing their faith, and with it the chance of salvation. We are not free to expose our children to so great a danger, and are bound in conscience to do all in our power to guard them against it, and to bring them up in the faith of the church, to be good and exemplary Catholics.

Evidently, then, the rule of allowing only our supposed "common Christianity" to be taught in schools does not solve the difficulty, or secure to the Catholic his freedom of conscience.

The exclusion of the Bible would not help the matter. This would only make the schools purely secular, which were worse than making them purely Protestant; for, as it regards the state, society, morality, all the interests of this world, Protestantism we hold to be far better than no religion—unless you include under its name free-lovism, free-religion, woman's-rightism, and the various other similar *isms* struggling to get themselves recognized and adopted, and to which the more respectable Protestants, we presume, are hardly less opposed than we are. If some Catholics in particular localities have supposed that the exclusion of the Protestant Bible from the public schools would remove the objection to them as schools for Catholic children, they have, in our opinion, fallen into a very great mistake. The question lies deeper than reading or not reading the Bible in the schools, in one version or another. Of course, our church disapproves the Protestant version of the Bible, as a faulty translation of a mutilated text; but its exclusion from the public schools would by no means remove our ob-

jections to them. We object to them not merely because they teach more or less of the Protestant religion, but also on the ground that we cannot freely and fully teach our religion and train up our children in them to be true and unwavering Catholics; and we deny the right of the state, the city, the town, or the school district, to tax us for schools in which we are not free to do so.

We value education, and even universal education—which overlooks no class or child, however rich or however poor, however honored or however despised—as highly as any of our countrymen do or can; but we value no education that is divorced from religion and religious culture. Religion is the supreme law, the one thing to be lived for; and all in life individual or social, civil or political, should be subordinated to it, and esteemed only as means to the eternal end for which man was created and exists. Religious education is the chief thing, and we wish our children to be accustomed, from the first dawning of reason, so to regard it, and to regard whatever they learn or do as having a bearing on their religious character or their duty to God. Mr. Bulwer—now Lord Lytton—as well as many other literary men of eminence, have written much on the danger of a purely intellectual culture, or of the education of the intellect divorced from that of the heart, or sentiments and affections. We hold that education, either of the intellect or of the heart, or of both combined, divorced from faith and religious discipline, is dangerous alike to the individual and to society. All education should be religious, and intended to train the child for a religious end; not for this life only, but for eternal life; for this life is nothing if severed from that which is to come.

Even for this world, for civilization itself, the religious education which the church gives is far better than any so-called secular education without it. The church has not always been able to secure universal secular education for all her children; but there can be no question that the illiterate classes of Catholic nations are far more civilized and better trained than are the corresponding classes of Protestant nations. There is no comparison in personal dignity, manliness, self-respect, courtesy of manner, refined feeling, and delicate sentiment, between an unlettered Italian, French, Spanish, or Irish peasant, and an unlettered Protestant German, English, or American. The one is a cultivated, a civilized man; the other is a boor, a clown, coarse and

brutal, who perpetually mistakes impudence for independence, and proves his self-respect by his indifference or insults to others. The difference is due to the difference of religion and religious culture; not, as is sometimes pretended, to difference of race. The church civilizes the whole nation that accepts her; only the upper classes in Protestant nations are civilized.

Of course, we do not, and cannot expect, in a state where Protestants have equal rights with Catholics before the state, to carry our religion into public schools designed equally for all. We have no right to do it. But Protestants have no more right to carry their religion into them than we have to carry ours; and carry theirs they do, when ours is excluded. Their rights are equal to ours, and ours equal to theirs; and neither does nor can, in the eyes of the state, override the other. As the question is a matter of conscience, and therefore of the rights of God, there can be no compromise, no splitting of differences, or yielding of the one party to the other. Here comes up the precise difficulty. The state is bound equally to recognize and respect the conscience of Protestants and of Catholics, and has no right to restrain the conscience of either. There must, then, be a dead-lock, unless some method can be discovered or devised by which the public schools can be saved without lesion either to the Protestant or the Catholic.

Three solutions have been suggested: 1. The first is to exclude the Bible and all religious teaching, or recognition, in any way, shape, or manner, of religion, from the public schools. This is the infidel or secular solution, and, so far as Catholics are concerned, is no solution at all. It is simple mockery. What we demand is, not that religion be excluded from the schools, but schools in which we can teach freely and fully our own religion to our own children. It is precisely these purely secular schools, in which all education is divorced from religion—from the faith, precepts, services, and discipline of the church, as well as education combined with a false religion—that we oppose. Nor will this solution satisfy the more respectable Protestant denominations, as is evident from the tenacity with which they insist on reading the Bible in the schools. They do not believe any more than we do in the utility, or even practicability, of divorcing what is called secular learning from religion. All education, they hold, as well as we, that is not religious, is necessarily anti-religious. This is a case in

which there is and can be no neutrality. We find this conclusively shown by some remarks in *The Christian World* before us, credited to Professor Tayler Lewis, the most learned and able thinker we are acquainted with among our Protestant contemporaries. The professor's remarks are so true, so sensible, and so much to our purpose, that, though not so brief as we could wish, our readers will hardly fail to thank us for transcribing them:

"Let us test this specious plea of neutrality. What does it imply? If carried strictly out to the exclusion of every thing religious, or having a religious tendency, it must consistently demand a like exclusion of every thing that in the least manifests the opposite tendency, under whatever specious disguises it may be veiled. It does not alter the case in the least that opinions, regarded as irreligious, or as undermining or in any way weakening the grounds of belief, take to themselves the specious names of literature, or politics, or political economy, or phrenology, or the philosophy of history. No such sham pass-words should give to Buckle and Combe admittance where Butler and Chalmers are shut out. Every thing that makes it less easy for the child to believe his catechism, 'taught at home,' as they say, is a break of the supposed concordat. The mere objection is to be heeded. It is enough that things seem so to serious men, as capable of correct reasoning as any on the other side; or that it is the opinion, the prejudice, if any choose so to call it, of a devout ignorance. The thoughtful religious man might be willing to forego his objection if there were or could be real impartiality. He might trust a true moral and religious training as fully able to counteract any thing of an opposite tendency. But to let in the enemy, and then take away the weapon of defence—this is a neutrality hard to be understood.

"Now, there can be no doubt of the fact that there is admitted into our schools, our colleges, our educational libraries, into the reading-rooms connected with them, much that is thus *deemed* irreligious in its tendency—at least, by the holders of our stricter creeds. There is much that is silently alienating the minds of their children from the doctrines held sacred by their fathers. We might go further: there is much that tends to undermine all religious belief, even of the freest cast. What young man can have his mind filled with the atheistical speculations of Mill and Spencer, or be exposed to the uncounteracted theories of Darwin and Huxley, and yet retain unimpaired his belief in a providence as taught by Christ—a providence that 'numbers the very hairs of our heads'—or listen as before to the prayer that ascends from the family altar? These writers profess a kind of theism, it is said; but wherein, as far as any moral power is concerned, does it differ from a belief in quadratic equations, or the dogmas of heat and magnetism?

"The matter, as we have stated it, would be too plain for argument

were it not for those magical words, *secular* and *sectarian*, that some are so fond of using. 'The state knows no religion,' they say; it is wholly 'a private concern' between the *individual* and his Maker. 'The state knows no God.' They wonder the zealous bigot cannot see how clear this makes every thing. If he would only assent to propositions so easy, so self-evident, we should have peace. But set these confident logicians to define what they mean by terms so fluently employed, or ask them to show us how the state can keep clear of all action, direct or indirect, for or against an interest so vital as religion, so all-pervading, so intimately affecting every other, and how soon they begin to stammer! What is secular? The one who attempts to define it would perhaps begin with a negative. It is that which has no connection with religion; no aspects, no relations, no tendencies, no suggestions, beyond this world, or, the narrowest view of it, this *age* or *seculum*. Now, let him apply it to particular branches of education. There is the learning of the alphabet, spelling, reading. But what shall the child read? It would be very difficult to find a mere reading-book—unless its contents were an empty gabble, like the nonsense Latin verses of some schools—that would not somewhere, and in some way, betray moral or immoral, religious or irreligious ideas, according to the judgment of some minds. But let us waive this, and go on. Arithmetic is secular. Geography is secular; though we have seen things under the head of physical geography that some classes of religionists might object to as betraying a spirit hostile to the idea of the earth's creation in any form. But go on. Including the pure mathematics, as being pure mathematics and nothing else, we have about got to the end of our definition. No thinking man would pretend that the departments of life and motion, chemistry, dynamics, physiology, could be studied apart from a higher class of ideas. But secularity would interfere here in a very strange way. When these roads of knowledge thus tend upward toward the eternal light, it would shut down the gate and eject the book. Natural philosophy, as taught by Newton and Kepler, gets beyond secularity. When, on the other hand, after the manner of Humboldt, Lamarck, and Darwin, its progress is in the direction of the eternal darkness, the study of it becomes entirely *unsectarian;* it violates no rights of conscience!

"In other departments, it is still more difficult to set the secular bound. History, the philosophy of history, political philosophy, psychology, ethics, however strong the effort to dereligionize them, do all, when left to their proper expansion, spurn any such bounds. Art, too, when wholly secularized; poetry stripped of its religious ideality; how long would they resist such a narrowing, suffocating process? A lower dogma was never maintained than this of a wholly secular education, or one more utterly *impracticable*. The subject must inevitably die under the operation, and religion must come back again into our schools and colleges, to save them from inanity and extinction.

"There may be stated here some reasons why this plea of neutrality,

though so false, is yet so specious and misleading. It arises from the fact that the statement of moral, religious, and theological ideas demands clear and positive language. The hostile forms, on the other hand, are disguised under vague and endlessly varying negations. They are Protean, too, in their appellations. They take to themselves the names of literature, art, philosophy, reform. This procedure shows itself in reading-books intended for our primary schools; in text-books prepared for the higher institutions; in essays and periodicals that strew the tables of reading-rooms attached to our colleges and academies; and, above all, in the public lecturing, male and female, which may be said to have become a part of our educational system. For example, should the writer of this attempt to explain before such an audience 'the doctrines of grace,' as they are called, or that unearthly system of ideas which can be traced through the whole line of the church—patristic, Roman, and Protestant—in their production of a strong unearthly character, then would be immediately heard the cry of bigotry, or the senseless yell of church and state. And now for the *opposing* 'dogmas,' as they really are, notwithstanding all their disguises. They make their entrance under endlessly varied forms. Pantheism has free admittance; but that is not dogmatic—it calls itself philosophy. In some lecture on progress, or history, the most essential of these old 'doctrines of grace' may be sneeringly ignored or covertly assailed; but that is literature. Darwinism is expounded, with its virtual denial of any thing like creation; or Huxleyism, which brings man out of the monkey, and the monkey out of the fungus; that is science. Or it may be the whining nonsense which glorifies the nineteenth century at the expense of the far honester eighteenth, and talks so undogmatically of the deep 'yearning' for something better—that is, 'the coming faith.' And so goes on this exhibition of impartiality, with its exclusion of every thing dogmatic and theological."

Neither Catholics nor Protestants who believe at all in religion will consent to be taxed to support infidel, pantheistic or atheistic education; and all so-called purely secular education is really nothing else. The temporal separated from the eternal, the universe from its Creator, is nothing, and can be no object of science. The first suggested solution must then be abandoned, and not be entertained for a moment by the state, unless it is bent on suicide; for the basis of the state itself is religion, and is excluded in excluding all religious ideas and principles.

2. The second solution suggested is to adopt in education the voluntary system, as we do in religion, and leave each denomination to maintain schools for its own children at its own expense. We could accept this solution, as Catholics,

without any serious objection; but we foresee some trouble in disposing of the educational funds held by several of the states in trust for common schools, academies, and colleges, and in determining to whom shall belong the school-houses, and academy and college buildings and fixtures, erected, in whole or in part, at the public expense. Besides, this would break up the whole public school system, and defeat the chief end it contemplates—that of providing a good common education for all the children of the land, especially the children of the poorer classes. Catholics, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians would establish and support schools, each respectively for their own children; but some other denominations might not, and the infidels, and that large class called *nothingarian*, most certainly would not. Only they who believe in some religion see enough of dignity in man, or worth in the human soul, to make the sacrifice of a penny for education. The Darwins, the Huxleys, the Lyells, and other unbelieving scientists of the day, were never educated in schools, academies, colleges, or universities founded by infidels. They graduated from schools founded by the faith and piety of those who believed in God, in creation, in Christ, in the life and immortality brought to light in the Gospel; and if they have devoted themselves to severe studies, it has not been from love of science, but in the ignoble hope of being able to dispense, in the explanation of nature, with God the Creator, and to prove that man is only a monkey developed, a condensed gas, or, as Dr. Cabanis defined him, simply "a digestive tube open at both ends."

Moreover, though we deny the competency of the state to act as educator, we hold that its duty toward both religion and education is something more than negative. We hold that it has positive duties to perform in regard to each. It cannot decide what religion its citizens shall accept and obey; but it is bound to protect its citizens in the free and full enjoyment of the religion they adopt for themselves. We cannot, for the sake of carrying a point which we hold to be true and certain, to be of great importance, ally ourselves with infidels, or lay down as a universal principle what our church has never approved, and what we may in the change of the tide be ourselves obliged to disavow. The state, with all its powers and functions, exists for religion, and is in all its actions subordinate to the eternal end of man. As the church teaches, and as the New England Puritans held, this

world is never the end; it is only a means to an end infinitely above itself. We will never dishonor truth so much as to concede for a moment that the state is independent of religion, that it may treat religion as a coördinate power with itself, with indifference, or look down upon it with haughty contempt, as beneath its notice, or to be pushed aside if it comes in its way. It is as much bound to consult the spiritual end of man, and to obey the law of God, which overrides all other laws, as is the individual.

We, of course, deny the competency of the state to educate, to say what shall or shall not be taught in the public schools, as we deny its competency to say what shall or shall not be the religious belief and discipline of its citizens. We, of course, utterly repudiate the popular doctrine that so-called secular education is the function of the state. Yet, while we might accept this second solution as an expedient, we do not approve it, and cannot defend it as sound in principle. It would break up and utterly destroy the free public school system, what is good as well as what is evil in it; and we wish to save the system by simply removing what it contains repugnant to the Catholic conscience—not to destroy it or lessen its influence. We are decidedly in favor of free public schools for all the children of the land, and we hold that the property of the state should bear the burden of educating the children of the state—the two great and essential principles of the system, and which endear it to the hearts of the American people. Universal suffrage is a mischievous absurdity without universal education; and universal education is not practicable unless provided for at the public expense. While, then, we insist that the action of the state shall be subordinated to the law of conscience, we yet hold that it has an important part to perform, and that it is its duty, in view of the common weal, and of its own security as well as that of its citizens, to provide the means of a good common school education for all its children, whatever their condition, rich or poor, Catholics or Protestants. It has taken the American people over two hundred years to arrive at this conclusion, and never by our advice shall they abandon it.

3. The first and second solutions must then be dismissed as unsatisfactory. The first, because it excludes religion, and makes the public schools nurseries of infidelity and irreligion. The second, because it breaks up and destroys

the whole system of free public schools, and renders the universal education demanded by our institutions impracticable, or unlikely to be given, and in so far endangers the safety, the life, and prosperity of the republic. We repeat it, what we want is not the destruction of the system, but simply its modification so far as necessary to protect the conscience of both Catholics and Protestants in its rightful freedom. The modification necessary to do this is much slighter than is supposed, and, instead of destroying or weakening the system, would really perfect it and render it alike acceptable to Protestants and to Catholics, and combine both in the efforts necessary to sustain it. It is simply to adopt the third solution that has been suggested, namely, that of dividing the schools between Catholics and Protestants, and assigning to each the number proportioned to the number of children each has to educate. This would leave Catholics free to teach their religion and apply their discipline in the Catholic schools, and Protestants free to teach their religion and apply their discipline in the Protestant schools. The system, as a system of free schools at the public expense, with its fixtures and present machinery, would remain unimpaired; and a religious education, so necessary to society as well as to the soul, could be given freely and fully to all, without the slightest lesion to any one's conscience, or interference with the full and entire religious freedom which is guarantied by our constitution to every citizen. The Catholic will be restored to his rights, and the Protestant will retain his.

This division was not called for in New England in the beginning; for then the people were all of one and the same religion; nor when only those who used the schools were taxed for their support. It was not needed even when there were only Protestants in the country. In demanding it now, we cast no censure on the original founders of our public schools. But now, when the system is so enlarged as to include free schools for all the children of the state at the public expense, and Catholics have become and are likely to remain a notable part of the population of the country, it becomes not only practicable, but absolutely necessary, if religious liberty or freedom of conscience for all citizens is to be maintained; and it were an act of injustice to Catholics, whose conscience chiefly demands the division, and a gross abuse of power, to withhold it. It may be an annoyance to Protestants that Catholics are here; but

they are here, and here they will remain; and it is never the part of wisdom to resist the inevitable. Our population is divided between Catholics and Protestants, and the only sensible course is for each division to recognize and respect the equal rights of the other before the state.

One objection of a practical character has been brought against the division by the New York *Tribune*. That journal says that, if the division could be made in cities and large towns, it would still be impracticable in the sparsely settled districts of the country, where the population is too small to admit, without too great an expense, of two separate schools, one Catholic and one Protestant. The objection is one that is likely to diminish in force with time. In such districts let each school receive its *pro rata* amount of the public money; if too little, let Catholic charity make up the deficiency for the Catholic, and Protestant charity for the Protestant school. Besides, in these sparsely settled districts there are few Catholics, and their children are far less exposed than in cities, large towns, and villages.

The more common objection urged is, that if separate schools are conceded to Catholics, they must not only be conceded to the Israelites, but also to each Protestant denomination. To the Israelites, we grant, if they demand them. To each Protestant denomination, not at all, unless each denomination can put in an honest plea of conscience for such division. All Protestant denominations, without a single exception, unless it be the Episcopalians, unite in opposing the division we ask for, and in defending the system as it is, which proves that they have no conscientious objections to the public schools as they are now constituted and conducted. The division to meet the demands of the Catholic conscience would necessitate no change at all in the schools not set apart for Catholic children; and the several denominations that are not conscientiously opposed to them now could not be conscientiously opposed to them after the division. We cannot suppose that any denomination of Protestants would consent to support a system of education that offends its own conscience for the sake of doing violence to the conscience of Catholics. Do not all American Protestants profess to be the sturdy champions of freedom of conscience, and maintain that where conscience begins there the secular authority ends? If the present schools do violence to no Protestant conscience, as we presume from their defence of them they do not, no Protestant denomina-

tion can demand a division in its favor on the plea of conscience; and to no other plea is the state or the public under any obligation to listen. If, however, there be any denomination that can in good faith demand separate schools on the plea of conscience, we say at once let it have them, for such a plea, when honest, overrides every other consideration.

But we are asked what shall be done with the large body of citizens who are neither Catholic nor Protestant? Such citizens, we reply, have no religion; and they who have no religion have no conscience that people who have religion are bound to respect. If they refuse to send their children either to the Hebrew schools or the Catholic schools, or, in fine, to the Protestant schools, let them found schools of their own, at their own expense. The constitutions of the several states guaranty to each and every citizen the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; but this is not guarantying to any one the freedom of not worshipping God, to deny his existence, to reject his revelation, or to worship a false God. The liberty guarantied is the liberty of religion, not the liberty of infidelity. The infidel has, under our constitution and laws, the right of protection in his civil and political equality; but none to protection in his infidelity, since that is not a religion, but the denial of all religion. He cannot plead conscience in its behalf, for conscience presupposes religion; and where there is no religious faith, there is, of course, no conscience. It would be eminently absurd to ask the state to protect infidelity, or the denial of all religion; for religion, as we have said, is the only basis of the state, and for the state to protect infidelity would be to cut its own throat.

These are, we believe, all the plausible objections that can be urged against the division of the public schools we demand; for we do not count as such the pretence of some over-zealous Protestants that it is necessary to detach the children of Catholics from the Catholic Church in order that they may grow up thorough Americans; and as the public schools are very effectual in so detaching them, and weakening their respect for the religion of their parents, and their reverence for their clergy, they ought on all patriotic grounds to be maintained in full vigor as they are. We have heard this objection from over-zealous Evangelicals, and still oftener from so-called liberal Christians and infidels; we have long been told that the church is anti-American,

and can never thrive in the United States; for she can never withstand the free and enlightened spirit of the country, and the decatholicizing influence of our common schools; and we can hardly doubt that some thought of the kind is at the bottom of much of the opposition the proposed division of the public schools has encountered. But we cannot treat it as serious; for it is evidently incompatible with the freedom of conscience which the state is bound by its constitution to recognize and protect, for Catholics as well as for Protestants. The state has no right to make itself a proselyting institution for or against Protestantism, for or against Catholicity. It is its business to protect us in the free and full enjoyment of our religion, not to engage in the work of unmaking our children of their Catholicity. The case is one of conscience, and conscience is accountable to no civil tribunal. All secular authority and all secular considerations whatever must yield to conscience. In questions of conscience the law of God governs, not a plurality of votes. The state abuses its authority if it sustains the common schools as they are with a view of detaching our children from their Catholic faith and love. If Catholics cannot retain their Catholic faith and practice and still be true, loyal, and exemplary American citizens, it must be only because Americanism is incompatible with the rights of conscience, and that would be its condemnation, not the condemnation of Catholicity. No nationality can override conscience; for conscience is catholic, not national, and is accountable to God alone, who is above and over all nations, all principalities and powers, King of kings and Lord of lords. But the assumption in the objection is not true. It mistakes the opinion of the American people individually for the constitution of the American state. The American state is as much Catholic as it is Protestant, and really harmonizes far better with Catholicity than with Protestantism. We hold that, instead of decatholicizing Catholic children, it is far more necessary, if we are to be governed by reasons of this sort, to unmake the children of Protestants of their Protestantism. We really believe that, in order to train them up to be, in the fullest sense, true, loyal, and exemplary American citizens, such as can alone arrest the present downward tendency of the republic, and realize the hopes of its heroic and noble-hearted founders, they must become good Catholics.

But this is a question of which the state can take no cog-

nizance. We have under its constitution no right to call upon it to aid us, directly or indirectly, in unmaking Protestant children of their Protestantism. Of course, before God, or in the spiritual order, we recognize no equality between Catholicity and Protestantism. Before God, no man has any right to be of any religion but the Catholic, the only true religion, the only religion by which men can be raised to union with God in the beatific vision. But before the American state, we recognize in Protestants equal rights with our own. They have the same right to be protected by the state in the freedom of their conscience that we have to be protected by it in the freedom of ours. We should attack the very freedom of conscience the state guaranties to all her citizens, were we to call upon it to found or to continue a system of public schools, at the public expense, intended or fitted to detach Protestant children from the religion of their parents, and turn them over to be brought up in the Catholic religion. We should prove ourselves decidedly un-American in so doing. Yet, we regret to say, this is precisely what the non-Catholic majority, inconsiderately we trust, are doing; and if the popular ministers of the several sects, like Dr. R. W. Clark, Dr. Sheldon, Dr. Bellows, Henry Ward Beecher, and the sectarian and secular press have their way, they will continue to do to the end of the chapter to us Catholics. They probably are not aware that they belie the Americanism they profess, and abuse the power their superiority of numbers gives them to tyrannize over the consciences of their fellow-citizens. This strikes us as very un-American, as well as very unjust.

We place our demand for separate schools on the ground of conscience, and therefore of right—the right of God as well as of man. Our conscience forbids us to support schools at the public expense from which our religion is excluded, and in which our children are taught either what we hold to be a false or mutilated religion, or no religion at all. Such schools are perilous to the souls of our children; and we dare avow, even in this age of secularism and infidelity, that we place the salvation of the souls of our children above every other consideration. This plea of conscience, which we urge from the depth of our souls, and under a fearful sense of our accountability to our Maker, ought to suffice, especially in an appeal to a state bound by its own constitution to protect the rights of conscience for each and all of its citizens, whether Protestant or Catholic.

One thing must be evident from past experience, that our children can be brought up to be good and orderly citizens only as Catholics, and in schools under the supervision and control of their church, in which her faith is freely and fully taught, and her services, discipline, and influences are brought to bear in forming their characters, restraining them from evil, and training them to virtue. We do not say that, even if trained in Catholic schools, all will turn out to be good practical Catholics and virtuous members of society; for the church does not take away free-will, nor eradicate all the evil propensities of the flesh; but it is certain that they cannot be made such in schools in which the religion of their parents is reviled as a besotted superstition, and the very text-books of history and geography are made to protest against it; or in which they are accustomed to hear their priests spoken of without reverence, Protestant nations lauded as the only free and enlightened nations of the earth, Catholic nations sneered at as ignorant and enslaved, and the church denounced as a spiritual despotism, full of craft, and crusted all over with corruption both of faith and morals. Such schools may weaken their reverence for their parents, even detach them from their church, obscure, if not destroy their faith, render them indifferent to religion, indocile to their parents, disobedient to the laws; but they cannot inspire them with the love of virtue, restrain their vicious or criminal propensities, or prevent them from associating with the dangerous classes of our large towns and cities, and furnishing subjects for the correctional police, our jails, penitentiaries, state prisons, and the gallows.

We are pointed to the vicious and criminal population of our cities, of which we furnish more than our due proportion, as a conclusive argument against the moral tendency of our religion, and a savage howl of indignation, that rings throughout the land, is set up against the legislature or the municipality that ventures to grant us the slightest aid in our struggles to protect our children from the dangers that beset them, though bearing no proportion to the aid granted to non-Catholics. Yet it is precisely to meet cases like ours that a public provision for education is needed and supposed to be made. Protestants make the great mistake of trying to cure the evil to which we refer by detaching our children from the church, and bringing them up bad Protestants, or without any religion. The thousand and one

associations and institutions formed by Protestant zeal and benevolence for the reformation or the bringing up of poor Catholic children, and some of which go so far as to kidnap little papist orphans or half orphans, lock them up in their orphan asylums, where no priest can enter, change their names so that their relatives cannot trace them, send them to a distance, and place them in Protestant families, where it is hoped they will forget their Catholic origin, all proceed from the same mistake, and all fail to arrest, or even to lessen, the growing evil. They necessarily provoke the opposition and resistance of the Catholic pastors, and of all earnest Catholics, who regard the loss of their faith as the greatest calamity that can befall Catholic children. So long as faith remains, however great the vice or the crime, there is something to build on, and room to hope for repentance, though late, for reformatiom and final salvation. Faith once gone, all is gone.

It is necessary to understand that the children of Catholics must be trained up in the Catholic faith, in the Catholic Church, to be good exemplary Catholics, or they will grow up bad citizens, the pests of society. Nothing can be done for them but through the approval and coöperation of the Catholic clergy and the Catholic community. The contrary rule, till quite recently, has been adopted, and public and private benevolence has sought to benefit our children by disregarding, or seeking to uproot, their Catholic faith, and rejecting the coöperation of the Catholic clergy. The results are apparent to all not absolutely blinded by their misdirected zeal.

The public have not sufficiently considered that by the law excluding our religion from the public schools, the schools as established by law are Protestant schools, at least so far as they are not pagan or godless. We do not suppose the state ever intended to establish Protestantism as the exclusive religion of the schools; but such is the necessary result of excluding, no matter under what pretext, the teaching of our religion in them. Exclude Catholicity, and what is left? Nothing of Christianity but Protestantism, which is simply Christianity *minus* the Catholic Church, her faith, precepts, and sacraments. At present the state makes ample provision for the children of Protestants, infidels, or pagans; but excludes the children of Catholics, unless we consent to let them be educated in Protestant schools, and brought up Protestants, so far as the schools can bring them up.

Now, we protest in the name of equal rights against this manifest injustice. There is no class of the community more in need of free public schools than Catholics, and none are more entitled to their benefit; for they constitute a large portion of the poorer and more destitute classes of the community. We can conceive nothing more unjust than for the state to provide schools for Protestants, and even infidels, and refuse to do it for Catholics. To say that Catholics have as free access to the public schools as Protestants, is bitter mockery. Protestants can send their children to them without exposing them to lose their Protestantism; but Catholics cannot send their children to them without exposing them to the loss of their Catholicity. The law protects their religion in the public schools by the simple fact of excluding ours. How then say these schools are as free to us as they are to them? Is conscience of no account?

We take it for granted that the intention of the state is that the public schools should be be accessible alike to Catholics and Protestants, and on the same risks and conditions. We presume it has had no more intention of favoring Protestants at the expense of Catholics, than Catholics at the expense of Protestants. But it can no longer fail to see that its intention is not, and cannot be realized by providing schools which Protestants can use without risk to their Protestantism, and none which Catholics can use without risk to their Catholicity. As the case now stands, the law sustains Protestantism in the schools and excludes Catholicity. This is unjust to Catholics, and deprives us, in so far as Catholics, of all benefit to be derived from the public schools supported at the public expense. Were the law to admit Catholicity, it would necessarily exclude Protestantism, which would be equally unjust to Protestants. Since, then, Catholicity and Protestantism mutually exclude each other, and as the state is bound to treat both with equal respect, it is not possible for it to carry out its intention and do justice to both parties, but by dividing the schools, and setting apart for Catholics their portion of them, in which the education shall be determined and controlled by their church, though remaining public schools supported at the public expense, under the provisions of a general law as now.

This would be doing for its Catholic citizens only what it now does for its Protestant citizens only; in fact, only what is done in France, Austria, and Prussia. The division would

enable us to bring all our children into schools under the influence and management of our pastors, and to do whatever the church and a thoroughly religious education can do to train them up to be good Catholics, and therefore orderly and peaceful members of society, and loyal and virtuous American citizens. It would also remove some restraint from the Protestant schools, and allow them more freedom in insisting on whatever is doctrinal and positive in their religion than they now exercise. The two classes of schools, though operating separately, would aid each other in stemming the tide of infidelity and immorality, now setting in with such fearful rapidity, and apparently resistless force, threatening the very existence of our republic. The division would operate in favor of religion, both in a Catholic sense and in a Protestant sense, and therefore tend to purify and preserve American society. It would restore the schools to their original intention, and make them, what they should be, religious schools.

The enemy which the state, which Catholics, and which Protestants have alike to resist and vanquish by education is the irreligion, pantheism, atheism, and immorality, disguised as secularism, or under the specious names of science, humanity, free-religion, and free-love, which not only strike at all Christian faith and Christian morals, but at the family, the state, and civilized society itself. The state has no right to regard this enemy with indifference, and on this point we accept the able argument used by the serious Protestant preachers and writers cited in the number of *The Christian World* before us against the exclusion of the Bible and all recognition of religion from the public schools. The American state is not infidel or godless, and is bound always to recognize and actively aid religion as far as in its power. Having no spiritual or theological competency, it has no right to undertake to say what shall or shall not be the religion of its citizens; it must accept, protect, and aid the religion its citizens see proper to adopt, and without partiality for the religion of the majority any more than the religion of the minority; for in regard to religion the rights and powers of minorities and majorities are equal. The state is under the Christian law, and it is bound to protect and enforce Christian morals and its laws, whether assailed by Mormonism, spiritism, free-lovism, pantheism, or atheism.

The modern world has strayed far from this doctrine, which in the early history of this country nobody questioned.

The departure may be falsely called progress, and boasted of as a result of "the march of intellect;" but it must be arrested, and men must be recalled to the truths they have left behind, if republican government is to be maintained, and Christian society preserved. Protestants who see and deplore the departure from the old landmarks will find themselves unable to arrest the downward tendency without our aid, and little aid shall we be able to render them unless the church be free to use the public schools—that is, her portion of them—to bring up her children in her own faith, and train them to be good Catholics. There is a recrudescence of paganism, a growth of subtle and disguised infidelity, which it will require all that both they and we can do to arrest. Fight, therefore, Protestants, no longer us, but the public enemy.*

*We desire to call attention to another point which could not be discussed in the foregoing article, and to which we can at present only allude in the briefest manner. Large sums of money have been granted by legislatures to universities and colleges which are controlled by the clergy of different Protestant denominations, in which they teach their religious opinions without restraint, and which they make, as far as they can, training-schools for their theological seminaries. Now, if the outcry against any grant of public funds to schools in which the Catholic religion is taught is taken up and sustained by Protestants, it follows that they must advocate the total secularization of all institutions, without exception, which enjoy any state subsidies, and, if they wish to keep control of religious instruction in any of the above-mentioned colleges, must refund to the state every thing which they now possess by grant from the state, and give up all claim to receive any further endowments. Catholics would never disendow or despoil these Protestant institutions, even if they had full power to do it; but if the party of infidelity ever gains, by the help of Protestants, full sway over our legislation, the latter may prepare themselves for a wholesale spoliation.

CHURCH AND STATE.*

[From the Catholic World for May, 1870.]

Cesare Cantù is one of the ablest men and most distinguished contemporary authors of Italy. He is a layman, and has usually been reckoned among the better class of so-called liberal Catholics, and certainly is a warm friend of liberty, civil and religious, a sincere and earnest Italian patriot, thoroughly devoted to the Holy See, and a firm and fearless defender of the rights, freedom, independence, and authority of the spiritual order in its relation to the temporal.

We know not where to look for a truer, fuller, more loyal, or more judicious treatment in so brief a compass of the great and absorbing question in regard to the relation of church and state, than in his article from the *Rivista Universale*, the title of which we give at the foot of the page. He is an erudite rather than a philosopher, a historian rather than a theologian; yet his article is equally remarkable for its learning, its history, its philosophy, its theology, and its canon law, and, with slight reservation, as to his interpretation of the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. and some views hinted rather than expressed as to the origin and nature of the *magisterium* exercised by the popes over sovereigns in the middle ages, we believe it as true and as exact as it is learned and profound, full and conclusive, and we recommend its careful study to all who would master the question it treats.

For ourselves, we have treated the question of church and state so often, so fully, and so recently, in its principle and in its several aspects, especially in relation to our own government, that we know not that we have any thing to add to what we have already said, and we might dispense ourselves from its further discussion by simply referring to the articles, *Independence of the Church*, *Union of Church and State*, *Rome and the World*, and to our more recent articles on *The Future of Protestantism and Catholicity*, especially the third and fourth; and also to the article on *The School Question*. We can do, and we shall attempt, in the present

* *Chiesa e Stato:* Rapsodie di C. Cantù, dalla *Rivista Universale*, 1867.

article, to do little more than bring together and present as a whole what is scattered through these several articles, and offer respectfully and even timidly such suggestions as we think will not be presumptuous in regard to the means, in the present emergency, of realizing more perfectly at home and abroad the ideal of Christian society.

We assume in the outset that there really exist in human society two distinct orders, the spiritual and the temporal, each with its own distinctive functions, laws, and sphere of action. In Christian society, the representative of the spiritual order is the church, and the representative of the temporal is the state. In the rudest stages of society the elements of the two orders exist, but are not clearly apprehended as distinct orders, nor as having each its distinct and proper representative. It is only in Christian society, or society enlightened by the Gospel, that the two orders are duly distinguished, and each in its own representative is placed in its normal relation with the other.

The type, indeed the reason, of this distinction of two orders in society is in the double nature of man, or the fact that man exists only as soul and body, and needs to be cared for in each. The church, representing the spiritual, has charge of the souls of men, and looks after their minds, ideas, intelligence, motives, consciences, and consequently has the supervision of education, morals, literature, science, and art. The state, representing the temporal, has charge of men's bodies, and looks after the material wants and interests of individuals and society. We take this illustration from the fathers and mediæval doctors. It is perfect. The analogy of church and state in the moral order, with the soul and body in the physical order, commends itself to the common sense of every one, and carries in itself the evidence of its justness, especially when it is seen to correspond strictly in the moral order, to the distinction of soul and body in the physical order. We shall take, then, the relation of soul and body as the type throughout of the ideal relation of church and state.

Man lives not as body alone, nor as soul alone, but as the union of the two, in reciprocal commerce. Soul and body are distinct, but not separate. Each has its own distinctive properties and functions, and neither can replace the other; but their separation is death—the death of the body only, not of the soul indeed, for that is immortal. The body is material, and, separated from the soul, is dust and ashes,

mere slime of the earth, from which it was formed. It is the same in the moral order with society, which is not state alone, nor church alone, but the union of the two in reciprocal commerce. The two are distinct, each has its distinctive nature, laws, and functions, and neither can perform the functions of the other, or take the other's place. But though distinct, they cannot in the normal state of society be separated. The separation of the state from the church is in the moral order what the separation of the body from the soul is in the physical order. It is death, the death of the state, not indeed of the church; for she, like the soul, nay, like God himself, is immortal. The separation of the state from the church destroys its moral life, and leaves society to become a mass of moral rottenness and corruption. Hence, the Holy Father includes the proposition to separate church and state, in his syllabus of condemned propositions.

The soul is defined by the church as the *forma corporis*, the informing or vital principle of the body. The church in the moral order is *forma civitatis*, the informing, the vital principle of the state or civil society, which has no moral life of its own, since all moral life, by its very term, proceeds from the spiritual order. There is in the physical order no existence, but from God through the medium of his creative act; so is there no moral life in society, but from the spiritual order which is founded by God as supreme lawgiver, and represented by the church, the guardian and judge alike of the natural law and the revealed law.

The soul is the nobler and superior part of man, and it belongs to it, not to make away with the body, or to assume its functions, but to exercise the *magisterium* over it, to direct and govern it according to the law of God; not to the body to assume the mastery over the soul, and to bring the law of the mind into captivity to the law in the members. So is the church, as representing the spiritual order, and charged with the care of souls, the nobler and superior part of society, and to her belongs the *magisterium* of entire human society; and it is for her in the moral order to direct and control civil society, by judicially declaring, and applying to its action, the law of God, of which she is, as we have just said, the guardian and judge, and to which it is bound by the supreme lawgiver to subordinate its entire official conduct.

We note here that this view condemns alike the absorption of the state in the church, and the absorption of the church in the state, and requires each to remain distinct from the other, each with its own organization, organs, faculties, and sphere of action. It favors, therefore, neither what is called theocracy, or *clerocracy* rather, to which Calvinistic Protestantism is strongly inclined, nor the supremacy of the state, to which the age tends, and which was assumed in all the states of gentile antiquity, whence came the persecution of Christians by the pagan emperors. We note further, that the church does not make the law; she only promulgates, declares, and applies it, and is herself as much bound by it as is the state itself. The law itself is prescribed for the government of all men and nations, by God himself as supreme lawgiver, or the end or final cause of creation, and binds equally states and individuals, churchmen and statesmen, sovereigns and subjects.

Such, as we have learned it, is the Catholic doctrine of the relation of church and state, and such is the relation that in the divine order really exists between the two orders, and which the church has always and everywhere labored with all her zeal and energy to introduce and maintain in society. It is her ideal of Catholic or truly Christian society, but which has never yet been perfectly realized, though an approach to its realization, the author thinks, was made under the Christian Roman emperors. The chronic condition of the two orders in society, instead of union and coöperation, or reciprocal commerce, has been that of mutual distrust or undisguised hostility. During the first three centuries, the relation between them was that of open antagonism, and the blood of Christians made the greater part of the world then known hallowed ground, and the Christians, as Lactantius remarks, conquered the world, not by slaughtering, but by being slaughtered. The pagan sovereign of Rome claimed, and was held to unite both powers in himself, and was at once *imperator*, *pontifex maximus*, and *divus*, or god. The state, even after the conversion of the empire and of the barbarians that overturned it and seated themselves on its ruins, never fully disclaimed the spiritual faculties conceded it by Græco-Roman or Italo-Greek civilization.

All through the middle ages, Kenelm Digby's ages of faith, when it is pretended the church had every thing her own way, and the haughty power of her supreme pontiffs and their tyranny over such meek and lamb-like temporal

princes as Henry IV., Frederic Barbarossa, and Frederic II. of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, Henry II. and John Lackland of England, have been the theme of many a school-boy declamation against her, and adduced by grave statesmen as an excuse for depriving Catholics of their liberty, confiscating their goods and cutting their throats—all through those ages we say, she enjoyed not a moment's peace, hardly a truce, and was obliged to sustain an unceasing struggle with the civil authority against its encroachments on the spiritual order, and for her own independence and freedom of action as the church of God. In this struggle, the struggle of mind against matter, or moral power against physical force, the church was far from being, at least to human eyes, always victorious, and she experienced more than one disastrous defeat. In the sixteenth century, Cæsar carried away from her the North of Europe, as he had long since carried away the whole East, and forced her, in the nations that professed to recognize her as representing the spiritual order, to make him such large concessions as left her little more than the shadow of independence; and the people and their rulers are now almost everywhere conspiring to take away even that shadow, and to render her completely subject to the state, or representative of the temporal order.

There is no opinion more firmly fixed in the minds of the people of to-day, at least according to the journals, than that the union of church and state is execrable and ought not to be suffered to exist. The words cannot be pronounced without sending a thrill of horror through society, and calling forth the most vigorous and indignant protest from every self-appointed defender of modern civilization, progress, liberty, equality, and fraternity. What is called the "liberal party," sometimes "the movement party," but what we call "the revolution," has everywhere for its *primum mobile*, its impulse and its motive, the dissolution of what remains of the union of church and state, the total separation of the state from the church and its assertion as the supreme and only legitimate authority in society, to which all orders and classes of men, and all matters, whether temporal or spiritual, must be subjected. The great words of the party, as pronounced by its apostles and chiefs, are "people-king," "people-priest," "people-God." There is no denying the fact. Science, or what passes for science, denies the double nature of man, the distinction between

soul and body, and makes the soul the product of material organization, or a mere function of the body; and the more popular philosophy suppresses the spiritual order in society, and therefore rejects its pretended representative; and the progress of intelligence suppresses God, and leaves for society only political atheism pure and simple, as is evident from the savage war-whoop set up throughout the civilized world against the syllabus of condemned propositions published by our Holy Father, December, 1864. This syllabus touched the deep wound of modern society, probed it to the quick, and hence the writhings and contortions, the groans and screechings it occasioned. May God grant that it touched to heal, exposed the wound only to apply the remedy.

But the remedy—what is it, where shall we seek it, and how shall it be applied? The question is delicate as well as grave, let it be answered as it may. The principles of the church are inflexible and unalterable, and must be preserved inviolate; and even the susceptibilities of both statesmen and churchmen, in regard to changes in old customs and usages, even when not unchangeable in their nature, are to be gently treated. The church is not less bound by the law of God than is the state; for she does not, as we have said, make the law, she only administers it. Undoubtedly, she has in a secondary sense legislative authority or power to enact canons or rules and regulations for preserving, carrying out, and applying the law, as the court adopts its own rules and regulations, or as does the executive authority, even in a goverment like ours, for executing the law enacted by the legislative power. These may no doubt, be changed from time to time by the church as she judges necessary, proper, or expedient in order the better to meet the changing circumstances in relation to which she is obliged to act. But even in these respects, changes must be made in strict conformity to law; and although they may be so made and leave the law intact, and affect only the modes or forms of its administration, they are not without a certain danger. The faithful may mistake them for changes or innovations in the law itself, and enemies may represent them as such, and sophistically adduce them against the church as disproving her immutability and infallibility.

There have been, and no doubt are still, abuses in the church growing out of its human side, which need changes

in discipline to reform them; but these abuses have always been exaggerated by the best and holiest men in the church, and the necessity of a change in discipline or ecclesiatical law, as distinguished from the law of God, is seldom, if ever, created by them. When evils exist that menace both faith and society, it is not the church that is in fault, but the world that refuses to conform to the law as she declares and applies it. It was not abuses in the church that were the chief cause of the revolt, the heresy and schism of the reformers in the sixteenth century; for they were far less then they had been one, two, three, or even four centuries previous. The worst abuses and greatest scandals which had previously obtained had already been corrected, and the pope had assembled the Fifth Council of the Lateran for the purpose of restoring discipline and rendering it still more effective. The evil originated in the temporal order as represented by the state, and grew out of secular changes and abuses. It was so then, it is so now, always was, and always will be so. Why, then, demand changes or reform in the church, which cannot reach them? The church causes none of the evils at any time complained of, and offers no obstacle to their removal, or the redress of social grievances. It is for the temporal to yield to the spiritual, not for the spiritual to yield to the temporal. Very true; and yet the church may condescend to the world in its weakness for the sake of elevating it to harmony with her own ideal. God, when he would take away sin, and save the souls he had created and which he loved, did not stand aloof, or, so to speak, on his dignity, and bid the sinner cease sinning and obey him, without stretching forth his hand to help him; but made himself man, humbled himself, took the form of a servant, and came to the world lying in wickedness and festering in iniquity, took it by the hand, and sweetly and gently led the sinner away from sin to virtue and holiness.

For four hundred years, the church has sought to maintain peace and concord between herself and the state by concordats, as the wisest and best expedient she found practicable. But concordats, however useful or necessary, do not realize the ideal of Christian society. They do not effect the true union of church and state, and cannot be needed where that union exists. They imply not the union, but the separation of church and state, and are neither necessary nor admissible, except where the state

claims to be separate from and independent of the church. They are a compromise in which the church concedes the exercise of certain rights to the state in consideration of its pledge to secure her in the free and peaceable exercise of the rest, and to render her the material force in the execution of her spiritual canons, which she may need but does not herself possess. They are defensible only as necessary expedients, to save the church and the state from falling into the relation of direct and open antagonism.

Yet even as expedients concordats have been at best only partially successful, and now seem on the point of failing altogether. While the church faithfully observes their stipulations so far as they bind her, the state seldom observes them in the respect that they bind it, and violates them as often as they interfere with its own ambitious projects or policy. The church has concordats with the greater part of the European states, and yet, while in certain respects they trammel her freedom, they afford her little or no protection. The state everywhere claims the right to violate or abrogate them at will, without consulting her, the other party to the contract. It has done so in Spain, in Italy, and in Austria; and if France at present observes the concordat of 1801, she does it only in the sense of the "organic articles," never inserted in it, but added by the First Consul on his authority alone, and always protested against by the supreme pontiff and vicar of Christ; and there is no foreseeing what the present or a new ministry may do. Even if the governments were disposed to observe them, their people would not suffer them to do so, as we see in Spain and Austria. Times have changed, and the governments no longer govern the people, but the people, or the demagogues who lead them, now govern the governments. The European governments sustain their power, even their existence, only by the physical force of five millions of armed soldiers.

There is evidently, then, little reliance to be placed on the governments; for they are liable, any day, to be changed or overthrown. The strongest of them hope to sustain themselves and keep the revolution in check only by concessions, as we see in the extension of suffrage in England, and the adoption of parliamentary government, under a constitutional monarch, in Austria, France, North Germany, and elsewhere. But as yet the concessions of the governments have nowhere strengthened them or weakened the

revolution. One concession becomes the precedent for another, and one demand satisfied only leads to another and a greater demand, while it diminishes the power of the government to resist. What is more, the closer the union of the church with the government the more helpless it becomes, and the greater the hostility it incurs. The *primum mobile* of the movement party, as we now find it, is not the love of honest liberty, or a liberty compatible with stable government, or the establishment of a democratic or republican constitution; and it is not hostile to the church only because she exerts her power to sustain the governments it would reform or revolutionize, but rather, because it regards them as upholding the church, which they detest and would annihilate. The *primum mobile* is hatred of the church. This is the reason why, even when the governments are well disposed, as sometimes they are, the people will not suffer them to observe faithfully their engagements to the church.

Here was the mistake of the brilliant but unhappy La Mennais. He called upon the church to cut herself loose from her entangling alliance with the state, and throw herself back on the people; which would have been not bad counsel, if the people were hostile to her only because they supposed her allied with despotic governments, or if they were less hostile to her than the governments themselves. But such is not the fact at present. The people are to-day controlled by Catholics who care little for any world but the present, by Protestants, rationalists, Jews, infidels, and humanitarians; and to act on the Lamennaisian counsel would seem very much like abandoning weak, timid, and too exacting friends, to throw one's self into the arms of powerful and implacable enemies. When, in the beginning of his reign, the Holy Father adopted some popular measures, he was universally applauded, but he did not win those who applauded him to the church; and his measures were applauded by the outside world only because believed to be such as would tend to undermine his own authority, and pave the way for the downfall of Catholicity. The movement party applauded, because they thought they could use him as an instrument for the destruction of the church. In the French revolution of February, 1848, originating in deep-seated and inveterate hostility to the church, the ready acceptance of the republic, the next day after its proclamation, by the French bishops and clergy, did not for a moment conciliate the hostility in which the revolution had

its origin. They were applauded indeed, but only in the hope of making use of them to democratize, or secularize, and therefore to destroy the church as the authoritative representative of the spiritual order. The bishops and priests, all but a very small minority, showed that they understood and appreciated the applause they received, by abandoning the revolution at the earliest practicable moment, and lending their support to the movement for the reëstablishment of imperialism; for they felt that they could more safely rely on the emperor than on the republic.

These facts and the reminiscences of the old French revolution, have created in the great majority of intelligent and earnest Catholics, wisely or unwisely, we say not, a profound distrust of the movement party, which professes to be the party of liberty, and which carries in its train, if not the numerical majority, at least the active, energetic, and leading minds of their respective nations, those that form public opinion and give its direction, and make them honestly believe that Catholic interests, which are not separable from the interests of society, will be best protected and promoted by the church's standing by the governments and aiding them in their repressive measures. Perhaps they are right. The church, of course, cannot abandon society; but in times like ours, it is not easy to say on which side lie the interests of society. Is it certain that they lie on either side, either with the governments as they are, or with the party opposed to them? At present the church neither directs the governments nor controls the popular or so-called liberal movement; and we confess it is difficult to say from which she and society have most to dread. Governments without her direction want morality, and can govern only by force; and popular movements not inspired or controlled by her are blind and lawless, and tend only to anarchy, and the destruction of liberty as well as of order, of morality as well as of religion as a directing and governing power. We distrust both.

For ourselves personally, we are partial to our own American system, which, unless we are blinded by our national prejudices, comes nearer to the realization of the true union as well as distinction of church and state than has heretofore or elsewhere been affected; and we own we should like to see it, if practicable there, introduced—by lawful means only—into the nations of Europe. The American system may not be practicable in Europe; but, if so, we think it

would be an improvement. Foreigners do not generally, nor even do all Americans themselves, fully understand the relation of church and state, as it really subsists in the fundamental constitution of American society. Abroad and at home there is a strong disposition to interpret it by the theory of European liberalism, and both they who defend and they who oppose the union of church and state, regard it as based on their total separation. But the reverse of this, as we understand it, is the fact. American society is based on the principle of their union; and union, while it implies distinction, denies separation. Modern infidelity or secularism is, no doubt, at work here as elsewhere to effect their separation; but as yet the two orders are distinct, each with its distinct organization, sphere of action, representatives and functions, but not separate. Here the rights of neither are held to be grants from the other. The rights of the church are not franchises or concessions from the state, but are recognized by the state as held under a higher law than its own, and therefore rights prior to and above itself, which it is bound by the law constituting it to respect, obey, and, whenever necessary, to use its physical force to protect and vindicate.

The original settlers of the Anglo-American colonies were not infidels, but, for the most part, sincerely religious and Christian in their way, and in organizing society aimed not simply to escape the oppression of conscience, of which they had been the victims in the mother country, but to found a truly Christian commonwealth; and such commonwealth they actually founded, as perfect as was possible with their imperfect and often erroneous views of Christianity. The colonies of New England inclined, no doubt, to a theocracy, and tended to absorb the state in the church; in the southern colonies, the tendency was, as in England, to establish the supremacy of the civil order, and to make the church a function of the state. These two opposite tendencies meeting in the formation of American society, to a great extent, counterbalanced each other, and resulted in the assertion of the supremacy of the Christian idea, or the union and distinction under the law of God, of the two orders. In principle, at least, each order exists in American society in its normal relation to the other; and also in its integrity, with its own distinctive nature, laws, and functions, and therefore the temporal in its proper subordination to the spiritual.

This subordination is, indeed, not always observed in practice, nor always even theoretically admitted. Many Americans, at first thought, when it is broadly stated, will indignantly deny it. We shall find even Catholics who do not accept it, and gravely tell us that their religion has nothing to do with their politics; that is, their politics are independent of their religion; that is, again, politics are independent of God, and there is no God in the political order; as if a man could be an atheist in the state, and a devout Catholic in the church. But too many Catholics, at home and abroad, act as if this were indeed possible, and very reasonable, nay, their duty; and hence the political world is given over to the violence and corruption in which Satan finds a rich harvest. But let the state pass some act that openly and undisguisedly attacks the rights, the freedom, or independence of the church, in a practical way, it will be hard to find a single Catholic, in this country at least, who would not denounce it as an outrage on his conscience, which shows that the assertion of the separation of politics from religion so thoughtlessly made, really means only the distinction, not the separation of the two orders, or that politics are independent, so long as they do not run counter to the freedom and independence of religion, or fail to respect and protect the rights of the church. Inexactness of expression, and bad logic do not necessarily indicate unsound faith.

Most non-Catholics will deny that the American state is founded on the recognition of the independence and superiority of the spiritual order, and therefore, of the church, and the confession of its own subordination to the spiritual, not only in the order of logic, as Cantù maintains, but also in the order of authority; yet a little reflection ought to satisfy every one that such is the fact, and if it does not, it will be owing to a misconception of what is spiritual. The basis of the American state or constitution, the real unwritten, providential constitution, we mean, is what are called the natural and inalienable rights of man; and we know no American citizen who does not hold that these rights are prior to civil society, above it, and held independently of it; or that does not maintain that the great end for which civil society is instituted is to protect, defend, and vindicate, if need be, with its whole physical force, these sacred and inviolable rights for each and every citizen, however high, however low. This is our American boast, our American

conception of political justice, glory. These rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are the higher, the supreme law for civil society, which the state, however constituted, is bound to recognize and obey. They deny the absolutism of the state, define its sphere, restrict its power, and prescribe its duty.

But whence come these rights? and how can they bind the state, and prescribe its duty? We hold these rights by virtue of our manhood, it is said; they are inherent in it, and constitute it. But my rights bind you, and yours bind me, and yet you and I are equal; our manhoods are equal. How, then, can the manhood of either bind, or morally oblige the other? Of things equal one cannot be superior to another. They are in our nature as men, it is said again, or, simply, we hold them from nature. They are said to be natural rights and inalienable, and what is natural must be in or from nature. Nature is taken in two senses; as the physical order or the physical laws constitutive of the physical universe, and as the moral law under which all creatures endowed with reason and free-will are placed by the Creator, and which is cognizable by natural reason or the reason common to all men. In the first sense, these rights are not inherent in our nature as men, nor from nature, or in nature; for they are not physical. Physical rights are a contradiction in terms. They can be inherent in our nature only in the second sense, and in our moral nature only, and consequently are held under the law which founds and sustains moral nature, or the moral order as distinct from the physical order.

But the moral law, the so-called law of nature, *droit naturel*, which founds and sustains the moral order, the order of right, of justice, is not a law founded or prescribed by nature, but the law for the moral government of nature, under which all moral natures are placed by the Author of nature as supreme law-giver. The law of nature is God's law; and whatever rights it founds or are held from it are his rights, and ours only because they are his. My rights, in relation to you, are your duties, what God prescribes as the law of your conduct to me; and your rights are, in relation to me, my duties to you, what God prescribes as the rule of my conduct to you. But what God prescribes he has the right to prescribe, and therefore can command me to respect no rights in you, and you to respect no rights in me, that are not his; and being his,

civil society is bound by them, and cannot alienate them or deny them without violating his law, and robbing him of his rights. Hence, he who does an injury to another wrongs not him only, but wrongs his Maker, his Sovereign, and his Judge.

Take any of the rights enumerated as inalienable in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. Among these is the right to life. This right all men and civil society itself are bound to treat as sacred and inviolable. But all men are created equal, and under the law of nature have equal rights. But how can equals bind one another? By mutual compact. But whence the obligation of the compact? Why am I obliged to keep my word? Certainly not by the word itself; but because I should deprive him of his right to whom I have pledged it. But I have given my word to assist in committing a murder. Am I bound to keep it? Not at all. Why not? Because I have pledged myself to commit a crime, to do a wrong or unjust act. Evidently, then, compacts or pledged words do not create justice, they presuppose it; and it is only in virtue of the law of justice that compacts are obligatory, and no compacts not conformable to that law can bind. Why, then, am I bound to respect your life? It is not you who can bind me; for you and I are equals, and neither in his own name can bind the other. To take your life would be an unjust act; that is, I should rob justice of its right to your life. The right to life is then the right to justice. But justice is not an abstraction; it is not a mental conception, but a reality, and therefore God; and hence the right for you or me to live is the right of him who hath made us and whose we are, with all that we are, all that we have, and all that we can do. Hence, the right to life is inalienable even by myself, and suicide is not only a crime against society, but a sin against God; for God owns it as his right, and therefore he has the right to command all men to hold it in every man sacred and inviolable, and never to be taken by other men or even civil society, but at his order. So of all the other rights of man.

If the rights of man are the rights of God in and over man as his creature, as they undeniably are, they lie in the spiritual order, are spiritual, not temporal. The American state, then, in recognizing the independence, superiority, and inviolability of the rights of man, does recognize, in principle, the independence, superiority, and inviolability of

the spiritual order, and its own subordination to it, and obligation to consult it and conform to it. It then recognizes the church divinely appointed and commissioned by God with plenary authority to represent it, and apply the law of God to the government of the people as the state no less than to the people as individuals. This follows as a necessary consequence. If God has made a supernatural revelation, we are bound by the natural law to believe it; and if he has instituted a church to represent the spiritual, or concreted the spiritual in a visible organism, with plenary authority to teach his word to all men and nations, and to declare and apply his law in the government of human affairs, we are bound to accept and obey her the moment the fact is brought sufficiently to our knowledge. This shows that the true church, if such church there be, is sacred and inviolable, and that what she declares to be the law of God is his law, which binds every conscience; and all sovereigns and subjects, states and citizens are alike bound to obey her. He who refuses to obey her refuses to obey God; he who spurns her spurns God; he who despises her despises God; and he who despoils her of any of her rights or possessions despoils God. Kings and the great of the earth, statesmen and courtiers, demagogues and politicians are apt to forget this, and because God does not instantly punish their sacrilege with a visible and material punishment, conclude that they may outrage her to their heart's content with impunity. But the punishment is sure to follow in due course, and so far as it concerns states, dynasties, and society, in the shape of moral weakness, imbecility, corruption, and death.

That the American state is true to the order it acknowledges, and never usurps any spiritual functions, we do not pretend. The American state copies in but too many instances the bad legislation of Europe. It from the outset showed the original vice of the American people; for while they very justly subjected the state to the law of God, they could subject it to that law only as they understood it, and their understanding of it was in many respects faulty, which was no wonder, since they had no infallible, no authoritative, in fact, no representative at all of the spiritual order, and knew the law of God only so far as taught it by natural reason, and spelt out by their imperfect light from an imperfect and mutilated text of the written word. They had a good major proposition, namely, the spiritual order

duly represented is supreme, and should govern all men collectively and individually, as states and as citizens; but their minor was bad. But we with our reading of the Bible do duly represent that order. Therefore, &c. Now, we willingly admit that a people reverencing and reading the Bible as the word of God, will in most respects have a far truer and more adequate knowledge of the law of God than those who have neither church nor Bible, and only their reason and their mutilated, perverted, and even travestied traditions of the primitive revelation retained and transmitted by gentilism, and therefore that Protestantism as understood by the American colonists is much better for society than the liberalism asserted by the movement party either here or in Europe; but its knowledge will still be defective, and leave many painful gaps on many important points; and the state, having no better knowledge, will almost inevitably misconceive what on various matters the law of God actually prescribes or forbids.

The American state, misled by public opinion, usurps the functions of the church in some very grave matters. It assumes the control of marriage and education, therefore of all family relations, of the family itself, and of ideas, intelligence, opinions, which we have seen are functions of the church, and both are included in the two sacraments of marriage and orders. It also fails to recognize the freedom and independence of the spiritual order in refusing to recognize the church as a corporation, a moral person, as capable of possessing property as any natural or private person, and therefore denies to the spiritual order the inalienable right of property. The American state denies to the church all possessory rights unless incorporated by itself. This is all wrong; but if no better, it is no worse than what is assumed by the state in every European nation; and the most that can be said is, that in these matters the state forgets the Christian commonwealth for the pagan, as is done everywhere else.

But except in these instances, the American state is, we believe, true to the Christian principle on which it is based, as true, that is, as it can be, in a mixed community of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. The state has no spiritual competency, and cannot decide either for itself or for its citizens which is or is not the church that authoritatively represents the spiritual order. The responsibility of that decision it does and must leave to its citizens, who must de-

cide for themselves, and answer to God for the rectitude of their decision. Their decision is law for the state, and it must respect and obey it in the case alike of majorities and minorities; for it recognizes the equal rights of all its citizens, and cannot discriminate between them. The church that represents for the state the spiritual order is the church adopted by its citizens; and as they adopt different churches, it can recognize and enforce, through the civil courts, the canons and decrees of each only on its own members, and on them only so far as they do not infringe on the equal rights of the others. This is not all the state would do or ought to do in a perfect Christian society, but it is all that it can do where these different churches exist, and exist for it with equal rights. It can only recognize them, and protect and vindicate the rights of each only in relation to those citizens who acknowledge its authority. This recognizes and protects the Catholic Church in her entire freedom and independence and in teaching her faith, and in governing and disciplining Catholics according to her own canons and decrees, which, unless we are greatly misinformed, is more than the state does for her, in any old Catholic nation in the world.

This is not tolerance or indifference; it only means that the state does not arrogate to itself the right to decide which is the true church, and holds itself bound to respect and protect equally the church or churches acknowledged as such by its citizens. The doctrine that a man is free before God to be of any religion, or of no religion as he pleases, or the liberty of conscience, as understood by the so-called liberals throughout the world, and which was condemned by Gregory XVI. of immortal memory, in his encyclical of August 15th, 1832, receives no countenance from the American state, and is repugnant to its fundamental constitution. Heretical and schismatic sects have, indeed, no rights; for they have no authority from God to represent the spiritual order, and their existence is, no doubt, repugnant to the real interests of society as well as destructive to souls; but in a community where they exist along with the true church, the state must respect and protect in them the rights of the spiritual order, not indeed because they claim to be the church, but because they are held to be such by its citizens, and all its citizens have equal rights in the civil order, and the equal right to have their conscience, if they have a conscience, respected and protected. The church of God

exacts nothing more of it in this respect than to be protected in her freedom to combat and vanquish the adherents of false churches or false religions with her own spiritual weapons. More she might exact of the state in perfect Christian society; but this is all that she can exact in an imperfect and divided Christian society, as is the case in nearly all modern nations.

This is the American system. Is it practicable in the old Catholic nations of Europe? Would it be a gain to religion, if suffered to be introduced there? Would the government, if it were accepted by the church, understand it as implying its obligation to respect and protect all churches equally as representing the spiritual order, or as asserting its freedom to govern and oppress all at will, the true church as the false? There is danger of the latter, because European society is not based on the Christian principle of the independence and inviolability of the rights of man, that is, the rights of God, but on the pagan principle of the state, that all rights, even the rights of the church, and society emanate from the state, and are revocable at its will. Hence the reason why the church has found concordats with the secular powers so necessary. In the sense of the secular authority, these concordats are acts of incorporation, and surrendering them by the church would be the surrender of its charter by a corporation. It would be to abandon all her goods to the state, leave her without a legal *status*, and with no rights which the state holds itself bound to recognize, protect, or enforce through its courts, any more than she had under the persecuting Roman emperors. This would be the furthest remove possible from the American system. Before the American system could be introduced into European states in the respect that it affords freedom and protection to the church in the discharge of her spiritual functions, the whole structure of European society would need to be reconstructed on the Christian foundation, or the basis of the inherent rights and supremacy of the spiritual order, instead of its present pagan or *Græco-Roman* basis of the supremacy of the city or state.

Undoubtedly, the liberals, or movement party, are, and have been, for nearly a century, struggling by all the means in their power, fair or foul, to overthrow European society, and reconstruct it after what they suppose to be the American model, but in reality on a basis, if possible, more pagan and less Christian than its present basis. They assert the

absolute supremacy of the state in all things; only, instead of saying with Louis XIV., "L'état, c'est moi," they say "L'état, c'est le peuple," but they make the people, as the state, as absolute as any king or kaiser ever pretended to be.

The church would, in their reconstructed society, not have secured to her the rights that she holds under our system, by the fact that it is based on the equal and antecedent rights of all citizens, really the rights of God, which limit the power of the state, of the people in a democratic state, and prescribe both its province and its duty.

Even with us, the American system has its enemies, and perhaps only a minority of the people understand it as we do, and some of the courts are beginning to render decisions which, if in one part, they sustain it, in another part flatly contradict it. The supreme court of Ohio, in the recent case of the School Board of Cincinnati, has decided very properly that the board could not exclude religion; but, on the other hand, it maintains that a majority of the people in any locality may introduce what religion they please, and teach it to the children of the minority as well as to their own, which is manifestly wrong; for it gives the majority of the people the power to establish their own religion, and exclude that of the minority when, in matters of religion, that is, in matters of conscience, votes do not count. My conscience, though in a minority of one, is as sacred and inviolable as it would be if all the rest of the community were with me. As in the Polish diet, a single veto suffices to arrest the whole action of the state. The American democracy is not what it was in 1776. It was then Christian after a Protestant fashion; it is now infected with European liberalism, or popular absolutism; and if we had to introduce the American system now, we should not be able to do it.

There are serious difficulties on both sides. The church cannot confide in the revolution, and the governments cannot or will not protect her, save at the expense of her independence and freedom of action. They, if we must believe any thing the journals say, threaten her with their vengeance, if she dares to make and publish such or such a dogmatic decision, or to define on certain points which they think touch them, what her faith is and always has been. This is a manifest invasion of her right to teach the word of God in its integrity, and simply tells her with the sword suspended over her head, that she shall teach only what is

agreeable to them, whether in God's word or not. This insolence, this arrogant assumption, applauded by the universal sectarian and secular press, if submitted to, would make the church the mere tool of the secular authority, and destroy all confidence in her teaching.

We know not how these difficulties on either side are to be overcome. The church cannot continue to be shorn of her freedom by the secular governments, and made to conform to their ambitious or timid politics, without losing more and more her hold on the European populations. Nor can she side with the revolution without perilling the interests of society from which her own cannot be separated. We see no way out of the dilemma but for her, trusting in the divine protection, to assert simply and energetically her independence of both parties alike, and confide in the faithful, as she did in the martyr ages, and as she does now in every heathen land.

We do not assume the propriety or necessity of trying to introduce the American system into the Old World, nor do we urge the church to break either with the governments or with the people; but we may, we hope, be permitted to say that what seems to us to be needed is, for the church to assert her independence of both so far as either attempts to control her in the free discharge of her functions as the church of God; and we think the faithful should be prepared for the consequences of such assertion, whatever they may prove to be. The church cannot fulfil her mission, which is not confined to the Catholic nations of Europe, but embraces the whole world, if she is thus denied her independence and crippled in her freedom of action. If the assertion of her independence in face of the temporal order deprives her of her legal status, and places her out of the protection of the civil law, it perhaps will, in the end, prove to be no serious calamity, or at least a less evil than her present cramped and crippled condition. She has held that position heretofore, and, aided by Him whose spouse she is, and who hath purchased her with his precious blood, she in that very condition conquered and subdued the world against the hostility of the most powerful empire that ever existed. What she has done once, she is no less able to do again. The worst that the state can do is to strip her of her temporalities, and forbid her to preach in the name of Jesus. The worst the revolution can do is the same, and in its fury to massacre bishops and priests, monks and nuns, men and women, because they choose to obey God rather than men.

Well, all this has been more than once. We have seen it in Ireland, where the church was despoiled of her revenues, the people of their churches, schools, colleges, and religious houses, and only not of the use of the graveyard; where Catholic worship was prohibited under pain of death, and armed soldiers hunted and shot down as a wild beast the priest who ventured to say mass in a private house, in a remote morass, or a cave in the mountain, and the faithful were slaughtered as sheep by fiery zealots or the graceless myrmidons of power; where not only the church was despoiled and left naked and destitute, but her children were also despoiled of their estates and reduced to poverty, while laws were devised with satanic ingenuity and enforced with savage ferocity to degrade and debase them, and to prevent them from escaping from their poverty or their enforced secular ignorance. Yet we have seen the faith in spite of all live and gain on its enemies, the church survive and even prosper; and only the last year, when offered freely a government subsidy for her clergy and her services, we have seen the noble Irish hierarchy, without a dissenting voice, refuse it, and prefer to rely on the voluntary offerings of the faithful to coming under any obligation to the temporal power.

In this country the people were, in the outset, as hostile to the church as they could be anywhere or in any age, and they are not even yet converted, very generally, into warm and eager friends; yet without any public provision, relying solely on the alms of the faithful at home and abroad, principally at home, the missionaries of the cross have been sustained, the widow's handful of meal and cruse of oil have not failed; and yet we have founded and sustained schools, colleges, universities, erected convents for men and for women, and are erecting throughout the whole country churches, the finest in it, and some of which may be regarded as architectural ornaments; and nearly all this has been achieved within a single lifetime.

Men who sit at their ease in Zion, and find their most engrossing occupation in solving an antiquarian problem, or disserting on some heathen relic just dug up, though the world is breaking up and falling to pieces around them, may be frightened at the prospect of being deprived of comforts they are used to; but let governments and peoples do their worst, they cannot do worse than heathen Rome did, worse than France did in the revolution of 1789, or England has

been doing in Ireland for three hundred years. Fear! What is there to fear? If God be for us who can be against us? The danger seems great, no doubt, to many; but let Catholics have the courage of their faith, and they will no longer fear him who can kill the body, and after that hath no more power. The danger before men of Christian courage will disappear as the morning mist before the rising sun. Can a Catholic fear poverty, want, labor, suffering, torture, or death in His cause who for our sakes became poor, and had not where to lay his head; who took the form of a servant, and obeyed unto death, even the death of the cross? Know we not that Catholic faith and Catholic charity can weary out the most cruel and envenomed persecutors, and in the end gain the victory over them? If the church finds it necessary, then, in order to maintain her independence, to incur the hostility of kings or peoples, and the loss of her goods, there need be no fear; God will not forsake her, and the charity of the faithful never faileth.

UNIFICATION AND EDUCATION.*

[From the Catholic World for April, 1871.]

Mr. Henry Wilson recently reëlected senator in congress from Massachusetts, may not be distinguished as an original thinker or as a statesman of commanding ability, but no man is a surer index to his party or a more trustworthy exponent of its sentiments and tendencies, its aims and purposes. This gives to his article in *The Atlantic Monthly*, indicating the policy to be pursued by the Republican party, a weight it might not otherwise possess.

Mr Wilson is a strong political partisan, but he is above all a fervent Evangelical, and his aim, we presume, is to bring his political party to coincide with his Evangelical party, and make each strengthen the other. We of course, as a Catholic organ, have nothing to say of questions in issue

---

**New Departure of the Republican Party.* By Henry Wilson. *The Atlantic Monthly.* Boston: January, 1871.

between different political parties so long as they do not involve the rights and interests of our religion, or leave untouched the fundamental principles and genius of the American system of government, although we may have more or less to say as American citizens; but when either party is so ill-advised as to aim a blow either at the freedom of our religion or at our federative system of government, we hold ourselves free, and in duty bound, to warn our fellow citizens and our fellow-Catholics of the impending danger, and to do what we can to avert or arrest the blow. We cannot, without incurring grave censure, betray by our silence the cause of our religion or of our country, for fear that by speaking we may cross the purposes of one party, and seem to favor the views and policy of another.

Mr. Wilson's *New Departure* is unquestionably revolutionary, and therefore not lawful for any party in this country to adopt. It is expressed in two words, National Unification and National Education—that is, the consolidation of all the powers of government in the general government, and the social and religious unification of the American people by means of a system of universal and uniform compulsory education, adopted and enforced by the authority of the united or consolidated states, not by the states severally each within its own jurisdiction and for its own people. The first is decidedly revolutionary and destructive of the American system of federative government, or the division of powers between a general government and particular state governments; the second, in the sense proposed violates the rights of parents and annihilates the religious liberty secured by the constitution and laws both of the several states and of the United States.

The general government, in our American political system, is not the national government, or any more national than the several state governments. The national government with us is divided between a general government having charge of our relations with other powers and internal matters of a general nature and common to all the states, and particular state governments having charge of matters local and particular in their nature, and clothed with all the powers of supreme national governments not expressly delegated to the general government. In the draft of the federal constitution reported by the committee to the convention of 1787, the word *national* was used, but the convention finally struck it out, and inserted wherever it oc-

curred the word *general*, as more appropriately designating the character and powers of the government they were creating. It takes under our actual system both the state governments and the general government to make one complete national government, invested with all the powers of government. By making the general government a supreme national government, we make it the source of all authority, subordinate the state governments to it, make them hold from it, and deprive them of all independent or undivided rights. This would completely subvert our system of government, according to which the states hold their powers immediately from the political people, and independently of any suzerain or overlord, and the general government from the states or the people organized as states united in convention. A more complete change of the government or destruction of the federative principle, which constitutes the chief excellence and glory of our system, it would be difficult to propose, or even to conceive, than is set forth in Mr. Wilson's programme.

Mr. Wilson, however, is hardly justified in calling the revolution he proposes a "New Departure." It has been the aim of a powerful party, under one name or another, ever since 1824, if not from the origin of the government itself. This party has been steadily pursuing it, and with increasing numbers and influence, ever since the anti-slavery agitation seriously commenced. At one time, and probably at all times, it has been moved chiefly by certain business interests which it could not advance according to its mind by state legislation, and for which it desired federal legislation and the whole power of a national government, but which it could not get because the constitution and the antagonistic interests created by slave labor were opposed to it. It then turned philanthropist and called in philanthropy to its aid—philanthropy which makes light of constitutions and mocks at state lines, and claims the right to go wherever it conceives the voice of humanity calls it. Under the pretext of philanthropy, the party turned abolitionist, and sought to bring under the action of the general government the question of slavery manifestly reserved to the states severally, and which it belonged to each to settle for itself in its own way. A civil war followed. The slaves were emancipated, and slavery abolished, professedly under the war-power of the Union, as a military necessity, which nobody regrets. But the party did not stop here. Forgetful that

the extraordinary war-power ceases with the war, and military necessity can no longer be pleaded, it has, under one pretext or another, such as protecting and providing for the freedmen and reconstructing the states that seceded, continued to exercise it ever since the war was over, and by constitutional amendments of doubtful validity, since ratified in part under military pressure by states not yet reconstructed or held to be duly organized states in the Union, it has sought to legitimate it, and to incorporate it into the constitution as one of the ordinary peace-powers of the government.

The party has sometimes coincided, and sometimes has not strictly coincided, with one or another of the great political parties that have divided the country, but it has always struggled for the consolidation of all the powers of government in the general government. Whether prompted by business interests or by philanthropy, its wishes and purposes have required it to get rid of all coördinate and independent bodies that might interfere with, arrest, or limit the power of congress, or impose any limitation on the action of the general government not imposed by the arbitrary will of the majority of the people, irrespective of their state organization.

What the distinguished senator urges we submit, therefore, is simply the policy of consolidation or centralization which his party has steadily pursued from the first, and which it has already in good part consummated. It has abolished slavery, and unified the labor system of the Union; it has contracted a public debt, whether needlessly or not, large enough to secure to the consolidation of the powers of a national government in the general government the support of capitalists, bankers, railroad corporators, monopolists, speculators, projectors, and the business world generally. Under pretence of philanthropy, and of carrying out the abolition of slavery, and abolishing all civil and political distinctions of race or color, it has usurped for the general government the power to determine the question of suffrage and eligibility, under the constitution and by the genius of our government reserved to the states severally, and sends the military and swarms of federal inspectors into the states to control, or at least to look after, the elections, in supreme contempt of state authority. It has usurped for the general government the power of granting charters of incorporation for private business purposes elsewhere than

in the District of Columbia, and induced it to establish national bureaus of agriculture and education, as if it was the only and unlimited government of the country, which it indeed is fast becoming.

The work of consolidation or unification is nearly completed, and there remains little to do except to effect the social and religious unification of the various religions, sects, and races that make up the vast and diversified population of the country; and it is clear from Mr. Wilson's programme that his party contemplate moulding the population of European and of African origin, Indians and Asiatics, Protestants and Catholics, Jews and pagans, into one homogeneous people, after what may be called the New England Evangelical type. Neither his politics nor his philanthropy can tolerate any diversity of ranks, conditions, race, belief, or worship. A complete unification must be effected, and under the patronage and authority of the general government.

Mr. Wilson appears not to have recognized any distinction between unity and union. Union implies plurality or diversity; unity excludes both. Yet he cites, without the least apparent misgiving, the fathers of the republic—Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, Jay, and Madison—who were strenuous for the union of the several states, as authorities in favor of their unity or consolidation in one supreme national government. There were points in which these great men differed among themselves—some of them wished to give more, some of them less, power to the general government—some of them would give more, some of them less, power to the executive, &c., but they all agreed in their efforts to establish the union of the states, and not one of them but would have opposed their unity or consolidation into a single supreme government. Mr. Wilson is equally out in trying, as he does, to make it appear that the strong popular sentiment of the American people, in favor of union, is a sentiment in favor of unity or unification.

But starting with the conception of unity or consolidation, and resolving republicanism into the absolute supremacy of the will of the people, irrespective of state organization, Mr. Wilson can find no stopping-place for his party short of the removal of all constitutional or organic limitations on the irresponsible will of the majority for the time, which he contends should in all things be supreme and unopposed. His republicanism, as he explains it, is therefore

incompatible with a well-ordered state, and is either no government at all, but universal anarchy, or the unmitigated despotism of majorities—a despotism more oppressive and crushing to all true freedom and manly independence, than any autocracy that the world has ever seen. The fathers of the republic never understood republicanism in this sense. They studied to restrict the sphere of power, and to guard against the supremacy of mere will, whether of the monarch, the nobility, or the people.

But having reached the conclusion that true republicanism demands unification, and the removal of all restrictions on the popular will, Mr. Wilson relies on the attachment of the American people to the republican idea to carry out and realize his programme, however repugnant it may be to what they really desire and suppose they are supporting. He knows the people well enough to know that they do not usually discriminate with much niceness, and that they are easily caught and led away by a few high-sounding phrases and popular catch-words, uttered with due gravity and assurance—perhaps he does not discriminate very nicely, and is himself deceived by the very phrases and catch-words which deceive them. It is not impossible. At any rate, he persuades himself unification or consolidation can be carried forward and effected by appeals to the republican instincts and tendencies of the American people, and secured by aid of the colored vote and woman suffrage, soon to be adopted as an essential element in the revolutionary movement. The colored people, it is expected, will vote as their preachers direct, and their preachers will direct as they are directed by the Evangelicals. The women who will vote, if woman suffrage is adopted, are Evangelicals, philanthropists, or humanitarians, and are sure to follow their instincts and vote for the unification or centralization of power—the more unlimited the better.

But the chief reliance for the permanence in power of the party of consolidation is universal and uniform compulsory education by the general government, which will, if adopted, complete and preserve the work of unification. Education is the American hobby—regarded, as uneducated or poorly educated people usually regard it, as a sort of panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to. We ourselves, as Catholics, are as decidedly as any other class of American citizens in favor of universal education, as thorough and extensive as possible—if its quality suits us. We do not,

indeed, prize so highly as some of our countrymen appear to do the simple ability to read, write, and cypher; nor do we believe it possible to educate a whole people so that every one, on attaining his majority, will understand the bearings of all political questions or comprehend the perplexities of statesmanship, the effects at large of all measures of general or special legislation, the bearing on productive industry and national wealth of this or that financial policy, the respective merits of free trade and protection, or what in a given time or given country will the best secure individual freedom and the public good. This is more than we ourselves can understand, and we believe we are better educated than the average American. We do not believe that the great bulk of the people of any nation can ever be so educated as to understand the essential, political, financial, and economical questions of government for themselves, and they will always have to follow blindly their leaders, natural or artificial. Consequently, the education of the leaders is of far greater importance than the education of those who are to be led. All men have equal natural rights, which every civil government should recognize and protect, but equality in other respects, whether sought by levelling downward or by levelling upward, is neither practicable nor desirable. Some men are born to be leaders, and the rest are born to be led. Go where we will in society, in the halls of legislation, the army, the navy, the university, the college, the district school, the family, we find the few lead, the many follow. It is the order of nature, and we cannot alter it if we would. Nothing can be worse than to try to educate all to be leaders. The most pitiable sight is a congressional body in which there is no leader, an army without a general, but all lead, all command—that is, nobody leads or commands. The best ordered and administered state is that in which the few are well educated and lead, and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed, content to follow, and do not aspire to be leaders. In the early days of our republic, when the few were better educated than now and the many not so well, in the ordinary sense of the term, there was more dignity in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the government, more wisdom and justice in legislation, and more honesty, fidelity, and capacity in the administration. In extending education and endeavoring to train all to be leaders, we have only extended presumption, pretension, conceit, indocility, and brought incapacity to the surface.

These, we grant, are unpopular truths, but they, nevertheless, are truths, which it is worse than idle to try to deny. Everybody sees it, feels it, but few have the courage to avow it in face of an intolerant and tyrannical public opinion. For ourselves, we believe the peasantry in old Catholic countries, two centuries ago, were better educated, although for the most part unable to read or write, than are the great body of the American people to-day. They had faith, they had morality, they had a sense of religion, they were instructed in the great principles and essential truths of the Gospel, were trained to be wise unto salvation, and they had the virtues, without which wise, stable, and efficient government is impracticable. We hear it said, or rather read in the journals, that the superiority the Prussian troops have shown to the French is due to their superior education. We do not believe a word of it. We have seen no evidence that the French common soldiers are not as well educated and as intelligent as the Prussian. The superiority is due to the fact that the Prussian officers were better educated in their profession, were less over-weening in their confidence of victory, and maintained better and severer discipline in their armies, than the French officers. The northern armies in our recent civil war had no advantage in the superior education of the rank and file over the southern armies, where both were equally well officered and commanded. The *morale* of an army is no doubt the great thing, but it does not depend on the ability of the common soldier to read, write, and cypher; it depends somewhat on his previous habits and pursuits—chiefly on the officers. Under the first Napoleon, the Prussians were not superior to the French, though as well educated. Good officers, with an able general at their head, can make an efficient army out of almost any materials.

It is not, therefore, for political or military reasons that we demand universal education, whether by the general government or under the state governments. We demand it as far as practicable, for other and far higher reasons. We want it for a spiritual or religious end. We want our children to be educated as thoroughly as they can be, but in relation to the great purpose of their existence, so as to be fitted to gain the end for which God creates them. For the great mass of the people, the education needed is not secular education, which simply sharpens the intellect and generates pride and presumption, but moral and religious

education, which trains up children in the way they should go, which teaches them to be honest and loyal, modest and unpretending, docile and respectful to their superiors, open and ingenuous, obedient and submissive to rightful authority, parental or conjugal, civil or ecclesiastical; to know and keep the commandments of God and the precepts of the church; and to place the salvation of the soul before all else in life. This sort of education can be given only by the church or under her direction and control; and as there is for us Catholics only one church, there is and can be no proper education for us not given by or under the direction and control of the Catholic Church.

But it is precisely education by the Catholic Church that Mr. Wilson and his party do not want, do not believe in, and wish to prevent us from having even for our own children. It is therefore they demand a system of universal and uniform compulsory education by the authority and under the direction of the general government, which shall effect and maintain the national unification proposed, by compelling all the children of the land to be trained in national schools, under Evangelical control and management. The end and aim of the *New Departure*, aside from certain business interests, is to suppress Catholic education, gradually extinguish Catholicity in the country, and to form one homogeneous American people after the New England Evangelical type. Of this there can be no reasonable doubt. The Evangelicals and their humanitarian allies, as all their organs show, are seriously alarmed at the growth of Catholicity in the United States. They supposed at first, that the church could never take root in our Protestant soil, that she could not breathe the atmosphere of freedom and enlightenment, or thrive in a land of newspapers and free schools. They have been disappointed, and now see that they reckoned without their host, and that, if they really mean to prevent the American people from gradually becoming Catholic, they must change fundamentally the American form of government, suppress the freedom of religion hitherto enjoyed by Catholics, and take the training of all children and youth into their own hands. If they leave education to the wishes and judgment of parents, Catholic parents will bring up their children Catholics; if they leave it to the states separately, Catholics in several of them are already a powerful minority, daily increasing in strength and numbers, and will soon be strong

enough to force the state legislatures to give them their proportion of the public schools supported at the public expense.

All this is clear enough. What, then, is to be done? Mr. Wilson, who is not remarkable for his reticence, tells us, if not with perfect frankness, yet frankly enough for all practical purposes. It is to follow out the tendency which has been so strengthened of late, and absorb the states in the Union, take away the independence of the state governments, and assume the control of education for the general government, already rendered practically the supreme national government; then, by appealing to the popular sentiment in favor of education, and saying nothing of its quality, get congress, which the Evangelicals, through the party in power, already control, to establish a system of compulsory education in national schools—and the work is done; for these schools will necessarily fall into Evangelical hands.

Such is what the distinguished Evangelical senator from Massachusetts calls a "New Departure," but which is really only carrying out a policy long since entered upon, and already more than half accomplished. While we are writing, Mr. Hoar, a representative in congress from Massachusetts, has introduced into the house of representatives a bill establishing a system of national education under the authority of the general government. Its fate is not yet known, but no doubt will be, before we go to press. The probabilities are that it will pass both houses, and if it does it will receive the signature of the president as a matter of course. The Evangelicals—under which name we include Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, Baptists and Methodists, &c.—all the denominations united in the Evangelical Alliance, constitute, with their political and philanthropic allies, the majority in congress, and the measure is advocated apparently by the whole Evangelical press and by the larger and more influential republican journals of the country, as any number of excerpts from them now before us will satisfy any one who has the curiosity to read them. We did think of selecting and publishing the more striking and authoritative among them, but we have concluded to hold them in reserve, to be produced in case any one should be rash enough to question our general statement. There is a strong popular feeling in many parts of the country in favor of the measure, which is a pet measure also of the Evangelical ministers generally, who are sure to exert their powerful in-

fluence in its support, and we see no reason to doubt that the bill will pass.

But while we see ample cause for all citizens who are loyal to the system of government which Providence enabled our fathers to establish, and who wish to preserve it and the liberties it secures, to be vigilant and active, we see none for alarm. The bill, if it passes, will be manifestly unconstitutional, even counting the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments as valid parts of the constitution; and there may be more difficulty in carrying it into effect than its framers anticipate. It is part and parcel of a New England policy, and New England is not omnipotent throughout the Union, nor very ardently loved; not all the members of the several Evangelical denominations will, when they understand it, favor the revolution in the government Mr. Wilson would effect. There are in those denominations many men who belong not to the dominant party, and who will follow their political rather than their denominational affinities; also, there are in them a large number, we should hope, of honest men, who are not accustomed to act on the maxim, "the end justifies the means," loyal men and patriotic, who consider it no less disloyalty to seek to revolutionize our government against the states than against the Union, and who will give their votes and all their influence to preserve the fundamental principles and genius of our federative system of government, as left us by our fathers, and resist, if need be, to the death the disloyal policy of unification and education proposed by Mr. Wilson.

The southern states are reconstructed and back now in their place in the Union, and will not be much longer represented by northern adventurers, or men of little ability and less character, but very soon by genuine southern men, who, while strictly loyal to the Union, will speak the genuine sentiments of the southern people. The attempt to new-englandize the southern people has not succeeded, and will not succeed. When to the southern people who will never acquiesce in the policy of unification, we add the large number of people in the northern states who from their political convictions and affinities, as well as from their conservative tendencies, will oppose consolidation, we may feel pretty sure that the policy Mr. Wilson presents as that of the Republican party will not be adopted, or if adopted will not be permitted to stand. As not wholly inexperienced in political matters, and looking at the present state of parties

and temper of the nation, we should say that Mr. Wilson, as a party man, has committed a blunder, and that, if he has fancied that his *New Departure* is fitted to strengthen his party as a political party, and to give it a new lease of power, he has miscalculated. Nothing in our judgment would be more fatal to the continuance of his party in power than for it boldly and unequivocally to accept Mr. Wilson's programme. There is such a thing as reaction in human affairs, and reactions are sometimes very powerful.

The educational question ought not to present any serious difficulty, and would not if our Evangelicals and humanitarians did not wish to make education a means of preventing the growth of the church and unmaking the children of Catholics as Catholics; or if they seriously and in good faith would accept the religious equality before the state which the constitution and laws, both of the Union and the several states, as yet recognize and protect. No matter what we claim for the Catholic Church in the theological order—we claim for her in the civil order in this country only equality with the sects, and for Catholics only equal rights with citizens who are not Catholics. We demand the freedom of conscience and the liberty of our church, which is our conscience, enjoyed by Evangelicals. This much the country in its constitution and laws has promised us, and this much it cannot deny us without breaking its faith pledged before the world.

As American citizens, we object to the assumption of the control of education, or of any action in regard to it, by the general government; for it has no constitutional right to meddle with it, and so far as civil government has any authority in relation to it, it is, under our system of government, the authority of the states severally, not of the states united. We deny, of course, as Catholics, the right of the civil government to educate, for education is a function of the spiritual society, as much so as preaching and the administration of the sacraments; but we do not deny to the state the right to establish and maintain public schools. The state, if it chooses, may even endow religion, or pay the ministers of religion a salary for their support; but its endowments of religion, when made, are made to God, are sacred, and under the sole control and management of the spiritual authority, and the state has no further function in regard to them but to protect the spirituality in the free and full possession and enjoyment of them. If it chooses to pay

the ministers of religion a salary, as has been done in France and Spain, though accepted by the Catholic clergy only as a small indemnification for the goods of the church seized by revolutionary governments and appropriated to secular uses, it acquires thereby no rights over them or liberty to supervise their discharge of their spiritual functions. We do not deny the same or an equal right in regard to schools and school-teachers. It may found and endow schools and pay the teachers, but it cannot dictate or interfere with the education or discipline of the school. That would imply a union of church and state, or, rather, the subjection of the spiritual order to the secular, which the Catholic Church and the American system of government both alike repudiate.

It is said, however, that the state needs education for its own protection, and to promote the public good or the good of the community, both of which are legitimate ends of its institution. What the state needs in relation to its legitimate ends, or the ends for which it is instituted, it has the right to ordain and control. This is the argument by which all public education by the state is defended. But it involves an assumption which is not admissible. The state, having no religious or spiritual function, can give only secular education, and secular education is not enough for the state's own protection or its promotion of the public good. Purely secular education or education divorced from religion, endangers the safety of the state and the peace and security of the community, instead of protecting and insuring them. It is not in the power of the state to give the education it needs for its own sake, or for the sake of secular society. The fact is, though statesmen, and especially politicians, are slow to learn it, and still slower to acknowledge it, the state, or secular society, does not and cannot suffice for itself, and is unable to discharge its own proper functions without the coöperation and aid of the spiritual society. Purely secular education creates no civic virtues, and instead of fitting unfits the people for the prompt and faithful discharge of their civic duties, as we may see in young America, and indeed in the present active and ruling generation of the American people. Young America is impatient of restraint, regards father and mother as old-fogies, narrow-minded, behind the age, and disdains filial submission or obedience to them, has no respect for dignities, acknowledges no superior, mocks at law

if he can escape the police, is conceited, proud, self-sufficient, indocile, heedless of the rights and interests of others —will be his own master, and follow his own instincts, passions, or headstrong will. Are these the characteristics of a people fitted to maintain a wise, well-ordered, stable, and beneficent republican government? Or can such a people be developed from such youngerlings? Yet with purely secular education, however far you carry it, experience proves that you can get nothing better.

The church herself, even if she had full control of the education of all the children in the land, with ample funds at her command, could not secure any thing better, if, as the state, she educated for a secular end alone. The virtues needed for the protection of the state and the advancement of the public or common good, are and can be secured only by educating or training the children and youth of a nation not for this life as an end, but for the life to come. Hence our Lord says, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you." The church does not educate for the secular order as an end, but for God and heaven; and it is precisely in educating for God and heaven that she secures those very virtues on which the welfare and security of the secular order depend, and without which civil society tends inevitably to dissolution, and is sustained, if sustained at all, only by armed force, as we have seen in more than one European nation which has taken education into its own hand, and subordinated it to secular ends. The education needed by secular society can be obtained only from the spiritual society, which educates not for this world, but for the world to come. The virtues needed to secure this life are obtained only by seeking and promoting the virtues which fit us for eternal life.

This follows necessarily from the fact that man is created with a spiritual nature and for an immortal destiny. If he existed for this life only, if he were, as some sciolists pretend, merely a monkey or a gorilla developed, or were like the beasts that perish, this indeed would not and could not follow, and the reconciliation of the nature and destiny of man with uniform human experience would be impossible. We should be obliged, in order to secure the peace and good order of society, as some unbelieving statesmen do not blush to avow, to educate in view of a falsehood, and take care to keep up the delusion that man has a religious nature

and destiny, or look to what is false and delusive for the virtues which can alone save us from anarchy and utter barbarism. Yet what would serve the delusion or the falsehood, if man differs not by nature from the dog or the pig? But if man has really a spiritual nature and an immortal destiny, then it must necessarily follow that his real good can in no respect be obtained but in being educated and trained to live for a spiritual life, for an immortal destiny. Should not man be educated according to his spiritual nature and destiny, not as a pig or a monkey? If so, in his education should not the secular be subordinated to the spiritual, and the temporal to the eternal? We know well, experience proves it, that even the secular virtues are not secured when sought as the end of education and of life, but only in educating and living for that which is not secular, and in securing the virtues which have the promise of the life of the world to come.

All education, as all life, should be religious, and all education divorced from religion is an evil, not a good, and is sure in the long run to be ruinous to the secular order; but as a part of religious education, and included in it, secular education has its place, and even its necessity. Man is not all soul, nor all body, but the union of soul and body; and therefore his education should include in their union, not separation—for the separation of soul and body is the death of the body—both spiritual education and secular. It is not that we oppose secular education when given in the religious education, and therefore referred to the ultimate end of man, but when it is given alone and for its own sake. We deny the competency of the state to educate even for its own order, its right to establish purely secular schools, from which all religion is excluded, as Mr. Webster ably contended in his argument in the Girard-will case; but we do not deny, we assert rather, its right to establish public schools under the internal control and management of the spiritual society, and to exact that a certain amount of secular instruction be given along with the religious education that society gives. This last right it has in consideration of the secular funds for the support of the schools it furnishes, and as a condition on which it furnishes them.

Let the state say distinctly how much secular education in the public schools it exacts, or judges to be necessary for its own ends, and so far as the Catholic Church has any thing to do with the matter it can have it. The church will not

refuse to give it in the schools under her control. She will not hesitate to teach along with her religion any amount of reading, writing, arithmetic, history, geography, music, and drawing, or the sciences and the fine arts, the state exacts and provides for; nor will she refuse to allow it to send, if it chooses, its own inspectors into her schools to ascertain if she actually gives the secular education required. Let it say, then, what amount of secular education it wants for all the children of the land, and is willing to pay for, and, so far as Catholics are concerned, it can have it, and of as good quality, to say the least, as it can get in purely secular schools, and along with it the religious education, the most essential to it as well as to the souls of all.

But the difficulty here, it is assumed, is that the spiritual society with us is divided into various denominations, each with its distinctive views of religion. That, no doubt, is a damage, but can be easily overcome by bearing in mind that the several divisions have equal rights, and by making the public schools denominational, as they are in Prussia, Austria, France, and to a certain extent in England, where denominational diversities obtain as well as with us. Where the community is divided between different religious denominations, all standing on a footing of perfect equality before civil society, this is the only equitable system of public schools that is practicable. If the state does not adopt it, it must—1, let the whole business of education alone, and make no public provision for it; 2, establish purely secular, that is, godless schools, from which all religion is excluded, to which no religious people can be expected to consent, and which would ruin both public and private virtue, and defeat the very purpose of all education; or, 3, it must practically, if not theoretically, recognize some one of the several denominations as the state religion, and remit the education of childhood and youth to its management and control, as is virtually the case with our present public schools, but which would be manifestly unjust to all the others—to non-Evangelicals, if Evangelicalism is made the state religion, or to the Evangelicals, if a non-Evangelical denomination be established as the religion of the state. The only way to be just to all is, as everybody can see, to recognize in practice as well as in profession the equal rights of all denominations in the civil order—make the public schools denominational, and give to each denomination that asks it for the sake of conscience its fair and honest proportion, to be as to their

internal economy, education, and discipline under its sole control and management.

Mr. Wilson proposes for our admiration and imitation the Prussian system of public schools, and though we do not know that it is superior to the Austrian or even the French system, yet we think highly of it. But, what the Evangelical senator does not tell us, the Prussian system is strictly the denominational system, and each denomination is free and expected to educate in its own schools its own children, under the direction of its pastors and teachers, in its own religion. The Prussian system recognizes the fact that different communions do exist among the Prussian people, and does not aim to suppress them or at unification by state authority. It meets the fact as it is, without seeking to alter it. Give us the Prussian system of denominational schools, and we shall be satisfied, even if education is made compulsory. We, of course, protest against any law compelling us to send our children to schools in which our religion cannot be freely taught, in which no religion is taught, or in which is taught in any shape or degree a religion which we hold to be false or perilous to souls. Such a law would violate the rights of parents and the freedom of conscience; but with denominational schools compulsory education would violate no one's conscience and no parental right. Parents ought, if able, to have their children educated, and if they will not send their children to schools provided for them by the public, and in which their religion is respected, and made the basis of the education given, we can see no valid reason why the law should not compel them. The state has the right, perhaps the duty, in aid of the spiritual society and for its own safety and the public good, to compel parents to educate their children when public schools of their own religion, under the charge of their own pastors, are provided for them at the public expense. Let the public schools be denominational, give us our proportion of them, so that no violence will be done to parental rights or to the Catholic conscience, and we shall be quite willing to have education made compulsory, and even if such schools are made national, though we should object as American citizens to them, we should as Catholics accept them. We hold state authority is the only constitutional authority under our system to establish schools and provide for them at the public expense; but we could manage to get along with national denominational schools as well as others

could. We could educate in our share of the public schools our own children in our own way, and that is all we ask. We do not ask to educate the children of others, unless with the consent or at the request of parents and guardians.

The Prussian system of denominational schools could be introduced and established in all the states without the least difficulty, if it were not for Evangelicals, their Unitarian offshoots, and their humanitarian allies. These are religious and philanthropic busy-bodies, who fancy they are the Atlas who upholds the world, and that they are deputed to take charge of everybody's affairs, and put them to rights. But they forget that their neighbors have rights as well as themselves, and perhaps intentions as honest and enlightened, and as much real wisdom and practical sagacity. The only obstacle to the introduction and establishment of a just and equitable system of public schools comes from the intolerant zeal of these Evangelicals, who seek to make the public schools an instrument for securing the national, social, and religious unification they are resolved on effecting, and for carrying out their purpose of suppressing the church and extirpating Catholicity from American soil. They want to use them in training our children up in the way of Evangelicalism, and moulding the whole American population into one homogeneous people, modelled, as we have said, after the New England Evangelical type. Here is the difficulty, and the whole difficulty. The denominational system would defeat their darling hope, their pet project, and require them to live and let live. They talk much about freedom of conscience and religious liberty and equal rights; but the only equal rights they understand are all on their side, and they cherish such a tender regard for religious liberty, have so profound a respect for it, that they insist, like our Puritan forefathers, on keeping it all to themselves, and not to suffer it to be profaned or abused by being extended to others.

Prussia, though a Protestant country, does not dream of making the public schools a machine either for proselytism or unification. She is contented to recognize Catholics as an integral part of her population, and to leave them to profess and practise their own religion according to the law of their church. Our Evangelicals would do well to imitate her example. We Catholics are here, and here we intend to remain. We have as much right to be here as Evangelicals have. We are too many to be massacred or exiled, and too important and influential a portion of the American

people to be of no account in the settlement of public affairs. We have votes, and they will count on whichever side we cast them ; and we cannot reasonably be expected to cast them on the side of any party that is seeking to use its power as a political party to suppress our church and our religion, or even to destroy our federative system of government, and to leave all minorities at the mercy of the irresponsible majority for the time, with no other limit to its power than it sees proper to impose on itself; for we love liberty, and our church teaches us to be loyal to the constitution of our country.

The wisest course, since there are different religious denominations in the country, is to accept the situation, to recognize the fact, acquiesce in it, and make the best of it. Any attempt to unmake, by the direct or indirect authority of the state, Catholics of their faith or any denomination of its belief, is sure to fail. Each denomination is free to use Scripture and reason, logic and tradition, all moral and intellectual weapons, against its rivals, and with that it should be contented. Whatever may be the rightful claims of the church in the theological order, she is contented with the civil protection of her equal rights in the political order. She asks—with the wealth, the fashion, the public opinion, the press, nine-tenths of the population of the country, and the seductions of the world against her—only "an open field and fair play." If she does not complain, her enemies ought to be satisfied with the advantages they have.

We have entered our protest against a party programme which threatens alike the genius of the American government and the freedom of religion, for so much was obviously our duty, both as Catholics and citizens. We are aware of the odds against us, but we have confidence in our countrymen that, though they may be momentarily deceived or misled, they will, when the real character of the programme we have exposed is once laid open to them, reject it with scorn and indignation, and hasten to do us justice.

THE SECULAR NOT SUPREME.*

[From the Catholic World for August, 1871.]

Dr. Bellows is the well-known pastor of All Souls' Church, and editor of the *Liberal Christian* in this city, a distinguished Unitarian minister, with some religious instincts and respectable literary pretensions. As a student in college and the Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, he was full of promise, and a great favorite of the late Edward Everett, himself originally a Unitarian minister and pastor of Brattle Street Church, Boston. E. P. Hurlbut was formerly one of the judges of the supreme court of this state, a lawyer by profession, with a passably clear head and a logical mind, who knows, if not the truth, at least what he means, and neither fears nor hesitates to say it. His pamphlet, as far as it goes, expresses, we doubt not, his honest thought, but his thought is the thought of a secularist, who admits no order above the secular, and holds that no religion not subordinate to and under the control of the civil power, should be tolerated. Both he and Dr. Bellows are from instinct and education hearty haters of the Catholic Church; but while he is content to war against her from the point of view of pure secularism or no-religion, that is, atheism, the reverend doctor seeks to clothe his hatred in a Christian garb and to war against Christ in the name of Christ.

Dr. Bellows, as a liberal Christian, and though a Protestant hardly allowed by his more rigid Protestant countrymen to bear the Christian name, has a double battle to fight: one, against the Evangelical movement, at the head of which is Mr. Justice Strong, of the supreme court, to amend the constitution of the United States so as to make orthodox Protestantism the official religion of the republic, which would exclude him and his Unitarian, Universalist, and Quaker brethren; and the other, against the admission

---

*1. *Church and State in America.* A Discourse given at Washington, D. C., January 25, 1871. By Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D. D. Washington: 1871.

2. *A Secular View of Religion in the State, and of the Bible in the Public Schools.* By E. P. Hurlbut. Albany: 1870.

of the equal rights of Catholics with Protestants before the American state. Catholics greatly trouble him, and he hardly knows what to do with them. According to the letter of the constitution of the Union and of the several states, unless New Hampshire be an exception, they are American citizens, standing in all respects on a footing of perfect equality with any other class of citizens, and have as much right to take part in public affairs, and to seek to manage them in the interests of their religion, as Protestants have to take part in them in the interests of Protestantism; but this is very wrong, and against the spirit of the constitution; for the nation is a Protestant nation, the country was originally settled by and belongs to Protestantism, and Catholics ought to understand that they are really here only by sufferance, that they do not in reality stand in relation to public questions on a footing of equality with Protestants, and have really no right to exert any influence in regard to the public policy of the country not in accordance with the convictions of the Protestant majority. He tells us, in the discourse before us and more distinctly still in the columns of the *Liberal Christian*, not to aspire as citizens to equality with Protestants as if we had as much right to the government as they have, and warns us that if we do we shall be resisted even unto blood.

The occasion of his outpouring of wrath against Catholics is that they have protested against being taxed for the support of a system of sectarian or godless schools, to which they are forbidden in conscience to send their children, and have demanded as their right either that the tax be remitted, or that their proportion of the public schools be set off to them, to be, as to education and discipline, under Catholic control. Dr. Bellows allows that the Catholic demand is just, and that by making it a question at the polls they may finally obtain it; but this is not to his mind, for it would defeat the pet scheme of Protestants for preventing the growth of Catholicity in the country, by detaching, through the influence of the public schools, their children from the faith of their parents. Yet as long as any religion, even the reading of the Bible, is insisted on in the public schools, what solid argument can be urged against the demand of Catholics, or what is to prevent Catholic citizens from making it a political question and withholding their votes from the party that refuses to respect their rights of conscience and to do them justice? Dr. Bellows says that

we cannot legally be prevented from doing so, but, if we do so, it will be the worse for us; for if we carry our religion to the polls the Protestant people will, as they should, rise up against us and overwhelm us by their immense majority, perhaps even exterminate us.

To prevent the possibility of collision, the reverend doctor proposes a complete divorce of church and state. He proposes to defeat the Evangelicals on the one hand, and the Catholics on the other, by separating totally religion and politics. Thus he says:

"It is the vast importance of keeping the political and the religious movements and action of the people apart, and in their own independent spheres, that makes wise citizens, alike on religious and on civil grounds, look with alarm and jealousy on any endeavors, on the part either of Protestants or Catholics, to secure any special attention or support, any partial or separate legislation or subsidies, from either the national or the state governments. I have already told you that Protestants, representing the great sects in this country, are now laboring, by movable conventions, to mould public opinion in a way to give finally a theological character to the constitution. In a much more pardonable spirit, because in accordance with their historical antecedents, their hereditary temper, and their ecclesiastical logic, the Roman Catholics in this country are, in many states, and every great city of the Union, using the tremendous power they possess as the make-weight of parties, to turn the public treasure in a strong current into their own channels, and thus secure an illegitimate support as a religious body. It is not too much to guess that more than half of the ecclesiastical wealth of the Roman Catholic Church in America, against the wishes and convictions of a Protestant country, has been voted to it in lands and grants by municipalities and legislatures trading for Irish votes. The Catholic Church thus has a factitious prosperity and progress. It is largely sustained by Protestants—not on grounds of charity and toleration, or from a sense of its usefulness (that were well privately done), but from low and unworthy political motives in both the great parties of the country. Now that Roman Catholics themselves should take advantage of their solidarity as a people and a church, and of the power of their priesthood, with all uninformed and some enlightened communicants, to turn the political will into a machine for grinding their ecclesiastical grist, is not unnatural, nor wholly unpardonable. But it is fearfully dangerous to them and to us. Their success—due to the sense of the Protestant strength which thinks it can afford to blink their machinations, or to the preoccupation of the public mind with the emulative business pursuits of the time, or to the confidence which the American people seem to feel in the final and secure divorce of church and state—their unchecked success encourages them to bolder and more bold demands, and accustoms the

people to more careless and more perilous acquiescence in their claims. The principle of authority in religion, which has so many temperamental adherents in all countries; the inherent love of pomp and show in worship, strongest in the least educated; a natural weariness of sectarian divisions, commonest among lazy thinkers and stupid consciences—all these play into the hands of the Romanists, and they are making hay while the sun shines.

"There are no reviews, no newspapers in this country, so bold and unqualified; none so unscrupulous and so intensely zealous and partisan; none so fearless and outspoken as the Catholic journals. They profess to despise Protestant opposition; they deride the feeble tactics of other Christian sects; they are more ultramontane, more Roman, more papal, than French, German, Austrian, Bavarian, Italian believers; they avow their purpose to make this a Roman Catholic country, and they hope to live on the Protestant enemy while they are converting him. They often put their religious faith above their political obligation, and, as bishops and priests, make it a duty to the church for their members to vote as Catholics rather than as American citizens. Not what favors the peace, prosperity, and union of the nation, but what favors their church, is the supreme question for them at every election; and American politicians, for their predatory purposes, have taught them this, and are their leaders in it.

"Now, as an American citizen, I say nothing against the equality of the rights of the Roman Catholics and the Protestants; both may lawfully strive, in their unpolitical spheres, for the mastery, and the law may not favor or disfavor either; nor can any thing be done to prevent Roman Catholics from using their votes as Roman Catholics, if they please. It is against the spirit, but not against the letter of the constitution. At any rate, it cannot be helped; only, it may compel Protestants to form parties and vote as Protestants against Roman Catholic interests, which would be a deplorable necessity, and lead, sooner or later, through religious parties in politics, to religious wars. The way to avoid such a horrible possibility—alas, such a threatening probability for the next generation—is at once to look with the utmost carefulness and the utmost disfavor upon every effort on the part of either Protestants or Catholics to mix up sectarian or theological or religious questions with national and state and city politics.

"Every appeal of a sect, a denominational church, or sectarian charity of any description, to the general government, or state or city governments, for subsidies or favors, should be at once discountenanced and forbidden by public opinion, and made impossible by positive statute. The Protestant sects in this country should hasten to remove from their record any advantages whatsoever guarantied to them by civil law to any partiality or sectarian distinction. The most important privilege they enjoy by law in most of the states is the right of keeping the Bible in the public schools. It is a privilege associated with the tenderest and

most sacred symbol of the Protestant faith—the Bible. To exclude it from the public schools is to the religious affections of Protestants like Abraham's sacrifice of his only son. When it was first proposed, I felt horror-stricken, and instinctively opposed it; but I have thought long and anxiously upon the subject, and have, from pure logical necessity and consistency, been obliged to change—nay, reverse my opinion. Duty to the unsectarian character of our civil institutions demands that this exclusion should be made. It will not be any disclaimer of the importance of the Bible in the education of American youth, but only a concession that we cannot carry on the religious with the secular education of American children, at the public expense and in the public schools. So long as Protestant Christians insist, merely in the strength of their great majority, upon maintaining the Bible in the public schools, they justify Roman Catholics in demanding that the public money for education shall be distributed to sects in proportion to the number of children they educate. This goes far to break up the common-school system of this country, and, if carried out, must ultimately tend to dissolve the Union, which morally depends upon the community of feeling and the homogeneity of culture produced by an unsectarian system of common schools."—*Church and State,* pp. 16-19.

But this proposed remedy will prove worse than the disease. The state divorced from the church, wholly separated from religion, is separated from morality; and the state separated from morality, that is, from the moral order, from natural justice inseparable from religion, cannot stand, and ought not to stand, for it is incapable of performing a single one of its proper functions. The church, representing the spiritual, and therefore the superior, order, is by its own nature and constitution as independent of the state as the soul is of the body; and the state separated from the church, or from religion and morality, is like the body separated from the soul, dead, a putrid or putrefying corpse. Exclude your Protestant Bible and all direct and indirect religious instruction from your public schools, and you would not render them a whit less objectionable to us than they are now, for we object not less to purely secular schools than we do to sectarian schools. We hold that children should be trained up in the way they should go, so that when old they will not depart from it; and the way in which they should go is not the way of pure secularism, but the way enjoined by God our Maker through his church. God has in this life joined soul and body, the spiritual and the secular, together, and what God has joined together we dare not put asunder. There is only one of two things that can satisfy us: either

cease to tax us for the support of the public schools, and leave the education of our children to us, or give us our proportion of the public schools in which to educate them in our own religion. We protest against the gross injustice of being taxed to educate the children of non-Catholics, and being obliged in addition to support schools for our own children at our own expense, or peril their souls.

We do not think Dr. Bellows is aware of what he demands when he demands the complete divorce of church and state, or the total separation of religion and politics. The state divorced from the church is a godles state, and politics totally separated from religion is simply political atheism, and political atheism is simply power without justice, force without law; for there is no law without God, the supreme and universal lawgiver. Man has no original and underived legislative power, and one man has in and of himself no authority over another; for all men by the law of nature are equal, and have equal rights, and among equals no one has the right to govern. All governments based on political atheism, or the assumption that politics are independent of religion, rest on no foundation, are usurpations, tyrannies, without right, and can govern, if at all, only by might or sheer force. To declare the government divorced from religion is to declare it emancipated from the law of God, from all moral obligation, and free to do whatever it pleases. It has no duties, and under it there are and can be no rights; for rights and duties are in the moral order and inseparable from religion, since the law of God is the basis of all rights and duties, the foundation and guaranty of all morality. The state, divorced from religion, would be bound to recognize and protect no rights of God or man, not even those natural and inalienable rights of all men, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is going further in the direction of absolutism than go the doctor's dear friends the Turks, whom he so warmly eulogizes in his letters from the East, for even they hold the sultan is bound by the Koran, and forbidden to do any thing it prohibits.

Dr. Bellows, doubtless, has no intention of divorcing the state from morality, and does not see that his proposition implies it. He probably holds that morality is separable from religion, for with him religion is simply sentiment or opinion; but in this he falls into the common mistake of all liberal Christians, and of many Protestants who regard liberal Christians as no Christians at all. Morality and religion

are inseparable, for morality is only the practical application in the several departments of life of the principles of religion. Without religion morality has no foundation, nothing on which to rest, is a baseless fabric, an unreality. Deny God, and you deny the moral law and the whole moral order, all right, all duty, all human accountability. The separation of all political questions from all religious questions, which the reverend doctor demands, is their separation from all moral questions, and is the emancipation of the state from all right and all duty, or the assertion of its unrestricted power to do whatever it pleases, in total disregard of all moral and religious considerations. Is this the doctrine of a Christian?

This surely is not the relation of church and state in America, and derives no support from the American order of thought. With us, the state is instituted chiefly for the protection of the natural rights of man, as we call them, but really the rights of God, since they are anterior to civil society, are superior to it, and not derived or derivable from it. These rights it is the duty of civil society to protect and defend. Any acts of the political sovereign, be that sovereign king or kaiser, nobility or people, contrary to these antecedent and superior rights are tyrannical and unjust, are violences, not laws, and the common-law courts will not enforce them, because contrary to the law of justice and forbidden by it. The American state disclaims all authority over the religion of its citizens, but at the same time acknowledges its obligation to respect in its own action, and to protect and defend from external violence, the religion which its citizens or any class of its citizens choose to adopt or adhere to for themselves. It by no means asserts its independence of religion or its right to treat it with indifference, but acknowledges its obligation to protect its citizens in the free and peaceable possession and enjoyment of the religion they prefer. It goes further, and affords religion the protection and assistance of the law in the possession and management of her temporalities, her churches and temples, lands and tenements, funds and revenues for the support of public worship, and various charitable or eleemosynary institutions. All the protection and assistance the benefit of which every Protestant denomination fully enjoys, and even the Catholic Church in principle, though not always in fact, would be denied, if the divorce Dr. Bellows demands were granted, and religion, having no rights politicians are

bound to respect, would become the prey of lawless and godless power, and religious liberty would be utterly annihilated, as well as civil liberty itself, which depends on it.

The chief pretence with Dr. Bellows for urging the complete divorce of church and state, is that Catholics demand and receive subsidies from the state and city for their schools and several charitable institutions. Some such subsidies have been granted, we admit, but in far less proportion to Catholics than they have to Protestants or non-Catholics. The public schools are supported at the public expense, by the school fund, and a public tax, of which Catholics pay their share, and these schools are simply sectarian or godless schools, for the sole benefit of non-Catholics. The subsidies conceded to a few of our schools do by no means place them on an equality with those of non-Catholics. We by no means receive our share of the subsidies conceded. The aids granted to our hospitals, orphan asylums, and reformatories are less liberal than those to similar non-Catholic institutions. So long as the state subsidizes any institutions of the sort, we claim to receive our proportion of them as our right. If the state grant none to non-Catholics, we shall demand none for ourselves. We demand equality, but we ask no special privileges or favors. The outcry of the sectarian and secular press against us on this score is wholly unauthorized, is cruel, false, and unjust. It is part and parcel of that general system of falsification by which it is hoped to inflame popular passion and prejudice against Catholics and their church.

Underlying the whole of the doctrine of this discourse is the assumption of the supremacy of the secular order, or that every American citizen is bound to subordinate his religion to his politics, or divest himself of it whenever he acts on a political question. This, which is assumed and partially disguised in Dr. Bellows, is openly and frankly asserted and boldly maintained in Judge Hurlbut's pamphlet. The judge talks much about theology, theocracy, &c., subjects of which he knows less than he supposes, and of course talks a great deal of nonsense, as unbelievers generally do; but he is quite clear and decided that the state should have the power to suppress any church or religious institution that is based on a theory or principle different from its own. The theory of the American government is democratic, and the government ought to have the power to suppress or exclude every church that is not democratically constituted.

Religion should conform to politics, not politics to religion. The political law is above the religious, and, of course, man is above God. In order to be able to carry out his theory, the learned judge proposes an important amendment to the constitution of the United States, which shall on the one hand prohibit the several states from ever establishing any religion by law; and, on the other, shall authorize congress to enact such laws as it may deem necessary to control or prevent the establishment or continuance of any foreign hierarchical power in this country founded on principles or dogmas antagonistic to republican institutions. He says:

"The following amendment is proposed to Article I. of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The words in italics are proposed to be added to the present article:

"ART. I. *Neither* Congress *nor any state* shall make *any* laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. *But Congress may enact such laws as it shall deem necessary to control or prevent the establishment or continuance of any foreign hierarchical power in this country founded on principles or dogmas antagonistic to republican institutions.*

"It is assumed that there is nothing in the constitution, as it stands, which forbids a *state* from establishing a religion, and that no power is conferred on Congress by the constitution to forbid a foreign hierarchical establishment in the United States. If such a power be needed, then the proposed amendment is also necessary."—*Secular View*, p. 5.

This proposed amendment, like iniquity, lies unto itself, for while it prohibits congress and the several states from making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, it gives to congress full power to control or prevent the establishment or the continuance—that is, to prohibit—the free exercise by Catholics of their religion, under the flimsy pretence that it is a foreign hierarchy founded on anti-republican principles. The hierarchy is an essential part of our religion, and any denial of its freedom is the denial of the free exercise of his religion to every Catholic, and of the very principle of religious liberty itself, which the constitution guaranties.

We of course deny that the Catholic hierarchy is a foreign hierarchy or anti-republican, for what is Catholic is universal, and what is universal is never and nowhere a foreigner; but yet, because its supreme pontiff does not reside personally in America, and its power does not emanate from the Ameri-

can people, Protestants, Jews, and infidels will hold that it is a foreign power, and anti-republican. The carnal Jews held the Hebrew religion to be a national religion, and because the promised Messiah came as a spiritual, not as a temporal and national prince, they rejected him. Infidels believe in no spiritual order, and consequently in no Catholic principle or authority; Protestants believe in no Catholic hierachy, and hold that all authority in religious matters comes from God, not through the hierarchy, but through the faithful or the people, and hence their ministers are *called*, not *sent*. It would be useless, therefore, to undertake to prove to one or another of these three classes that the Catholic hierarchy is at home here in America, as much so as at Rome, and, since it holds not from the people, that it is not founded on anti-republican or anti-democratic principles. The only arguments we could use to prove it lie in an order of thought which they are not familiar with, do not even recognize, and to be appreciated demand a spiritual apprehension which, though not above natural reason, is quite too high for such confirmed secularists as ex-Judge Hurlbut and his rationalistic brethren, who have lost all conception, not only of the supernatural order, but of the supersensible, the intelligible, the universal reality above individual or particular existences.

For Catholics there are two orders, the secular and the spiritual. The secular is bound by the limitations and conditions of time and place; the spiritual is above and independent of all such conditions and limitations, and is universal, always and everywhere the same. The Catholic hierarchy represents in the secular and visible world, in the affairs of individuals and nations, this spiritual order, on which the whole secular order depends, and which therefore, is an alien nowhere and at home everywhere. The Catholic hierarchy is supernatural, not natural, and, therefore, no more a foreigner in one nation than in another. But it is only the Catholic that can see and understand this; it is too high and too intellectual for non-Catholics, whose minds are turned earthward, and have lost the habit of looking upward, and to recover it must be touched by the quickening and elevating power of grace. We must expect them, therefore, to vote the Catholic hierarchy to be in this country a foreign hierarchy, although it is nowhere national, and is no more foreign here than is God himself.

The Catholic hierarchy is not founded on democratic prin-

ciples, we grant, but there is nothing in its principles or dogmas antagonistical to republican government, if government at all; but since it holds not from the people, nor in any sense depends on them for its authority, non-Catholics, who recognize no power above the people, will vote it anti-republican, undemocratic, antagonistical to the American system of government. It is of no use to try to persuade them to the contrary, or to allege that it is of the very essence and design of religion to assert the supremacy of an order which does not hold from the people, and is above them both individually and collectively, or to maintain in the direction and government of human affairs the supremacy of the law of God, which all men and nations in both public and private matters, are bound to obey, and which none can disobey with impunity. They will only reply that this is repugnant to the democratic tendencies of the age, is contrary to the free and enlightened spirit of the nineteenth century, denies the original, absolute, and underived sovereignty of the people, and is manifestly a return to the theocratic principle which humanity rejects with horror. To an argument of this sort there, of course, is no available answer. The men who use it are impervious to logic or common sense, for they either believe in no God, or that God is altogether like one of themselves; therefore, in no respect above themselves.

It is very clear, then, if Judge Hurlbut's proposed amendment to the constitution were adopted, it would be interpreted as giving to congress, as the judge intends it should, the power to supress, according to its discretion, the Catholic hierarchy, and therefore the Catholic Church in the United States, and that, too, notwithstanding the very amendment denies to congress the power to prohibit to any one the free exercise of his religion. How true it is, as the Psalmist says, "Iniquity hath lied to itself"! The enemies of the church, who are necessarily the enemies of God, and, therefore, of the truth, are not able to frame an argument or a law against the church that does not contradict or belie itself; yet are they, in their own estimation, the *enlightened* portion of mankind, and Catholics are weak, besotted, grovelling in ignorance and superstition.

There is little doubt that the amendment proposed by Judge Hurlbut would, if adopted, effect the object the Evangelical sects are conspiring with Jews and infidels to effect, so far as human power can effect it—that is, the sup-

pression of the Catholic Church in the United States, and it is a bolder, more direct, and honester way of coming at it than the fair-seeming but insidious amendment proposed by Mr. Justice Strong, of the supreme court of the United States, and his Evangelical allies. It is now well understood by non-Catholic leaders that the growth of the church cannot be prevented or retarded by arguments drawn from Scripture or reason, for both Scripture and reason are found to be on her side, and dead against them. They see very clearly that if she is left free with "an open field and fair play," it is all over with her opponents. They must then contrive in some way, by some means or other, to suppress the religious freedom and equality now guarantied by our constitution and laws, and bring the civil law or the physical power of the state to bear against the church and the freedom of Catholics. That it is a settled design on the part of the leading Protestant sects to do this—and that they are aided by Unitarians and Universalists, because they know that Protestant orthodoxy would soon go by the board if the Catholic Church were suppressed; by the Jews, because they hate Christianity, and know well that Christianity and the Catholic Church stand or fall together; and by unbelievers and secularists, because they would abolish all religion, and they feel that they cannot effect their purpose if the Catholic Church stands in their way—no one can seriously doubt. We include the Jews in this conspiracy for we have before us the report of a remarkable discourse delivered lately in the Hebrew synagogue at Washington, D. C., by the Rabbi Lilienthal, of Cincinnati, entitled "First the State, then the Church," which is directed almost wholly against the Catholic Church. We make an extract from this discourse, longer than we can well afford room for, but our readers will thank us for it:

"Of all the questions which demand our serious consideration, none is of more importance than the one, 'Shall the state or the church rule supreme? All over Europe this question is mooted at present, and threatens to assume quite formidable proportions. There is but one empire across the ocean in which this problem, so far, has been definitely settled by virtue of autocratic might and power. It is Russia. When, in the seventeenth century, the Patriarch of Moscow had died, and the metropolitans and archbishops of the Greek Church met for the purpose of filling the vacancy, Peter the Great rushed with drawn sword into their meeting, and, throwing the same on the table, exclaimed, 'Here is your patriarch.' Since that time the czar is emperor and pope at once;

and very significantly, the 'Holy Synod,' or the supreme ecclesiastical court of Russia, is presided over by a general, the representative of the czar. And hence the Emperor Nicholas used to say: State and church are represented in me; and the motto ruling the Russian government was autocracy, Russian nationality, and the Greek Church.

"But everywhere else in Europe this question agitates the old continent. In Great Britain, Gladstone works for the enfranchisement of the church; the Thirty-nine Articles, so renowned at Oxford and Cambridge, are going to be abolished, and High Churchmen and Dissenters prepare themselves for the final struggle. Italy, so long priest-ridden, has inscribed on her national banner the glorious words, 'Religious liberty,' and means to carry them out to the fullest extent, in spite of all anathemas and excommunications. Spain, though still timid and wavering, has adopted the same policy. Austria has thrown off her concordat, and inserted in her new constitution the same modern principle; and the German empire has fully recognized the equality of all citizens, without difference of creed or denomination, before the courts and tribunals of resurrected and united Germany.

"But daily we hear of the demands of the clergy, made in the interests of their church. Since the last œcumenical council has proclaimed the new dogma of papal infallibility, the bishops want to discharge all teachers and professors, both at the theological seminaries and universities, who are unwilling to subscribe to this new tenet of the Roman Church. The archbishop of Gnesen and Posen even asked for the names of all those men who at the last election of members for the German parliament did not vote for those men he had proposed as candidates. The government is now bound to interfere, but nobody can tell how this coming conflict between church and state will be decided.

"This is the aspect of the old continent. What is the prospect in America, in our glorious and God-blessed country? Of course, religious liberty in the fullest sense of the word, is the supreme law of the land. It is the most precious gem in the diadem of our republic. It is warranted and secured by our constitution.

"The immortal signers of the Declaration of Independence; those modern prophets and apostles of humanity; those statesmen who thoroughly appreciated the bloody lessons of past history, knew but too well what they were doing when they entirely separated church and state, and ignored all sectarian sentiments in the inspired documents they bequeathed to their descendants. The denominational peace that heretofore characterized the mighty and unequalled growth of the young republic bears testimony to their wisdom, foresight, and statesmanship.

"But, alas! our horizon, too, begins to be clouded. The harmony that heretofore prevailed between the various churches and denominations begins to be disturbed. Then we had in the last two years the conventions at Pittsburg and Philadelphia. The men united there meant to insert God in our constitution, as we have him already on our

coins, by the inscription, 'In God we trust.' They intend to christianize our country, against the clear and emphatic spirit and letter of the constitution. And I must leave it to the learned judge of the supreme court of the United States who presided over those meetings, to decide whether this future Christian country hereafter shall be a Catholic or a Protestant country.

"The Roman Catholic press and pulpit are not slow in answering this question. With praiseworthy frankness and manliness they declare the intentions of their church. Father Hecker says: 'In fifteen years we will take this country and build our institutions over the grave of Protestantism. . . . There is, ere long, to be a state religion in this country, and that state religion is to be Roman Catholic.' Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, says: 'Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.' The archbishop of St. Louis says: 'If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will, an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country will be at an end.' And the pope speaks of the 'delirium of toleration, and asserts the right to punish criminals in the order of ideas.'

"This language is plain, unequivocal, and cannot be misinterpreted. Still, I am not an alarmist. I have too much faith in the sound common sense of the American people that they should barter away their political birthright for any theological or clerical controversy. They are too much addicted to the policy of 'a second sober thought,' that, after having first of all taught the human race the invaluable blessings of religious liberty, they should discard them just now, when the whole civilized world is imitating the glorious example set by our great and noble sires.

"But, 'vigilance being the price of liberty,' in the face of this assertion it is not only right, but an imperative duty, to enlighten ourselves on this all-important subject, so that we may take our choice, and perform our duties as true, loyal citizens and true, loyal Americans."

This is very much to the purpose, and if it shows that the rabbi is no friend of Protestant Christianity, it shows that his principal hostility is to the Catholic Church, as the body and support of Christianity. He exults, as well he may, over the falling away from the church of the old Catholic governments of Europe, for one of the chief instruments in effecting that apostasy has been precisely his Hebrew brethren, the great supporters of the anti-Catholic revolution of modern times; and his slanders on the Catholic Church are in the very spirit of the Evangelical Alliance, even to the false charges he brings against distinguished individual Catholics. The assertion that "Father Hecker says, 'In fifteen years we will take this country and build our institu-

tions over the grave of Protestantism,'" as that other assertion, "There is or ought to be a state religion in this country, and that state religion is to be Roman Catholic," Father Hecker himself assures us, is false. He never did, nor with his views ever could, say any thing of the sort. Bishop O'Connor, late of Pittsburg, never did and never could have said, "Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world." We happen to know that his views were and are very different; and if they were not, he is too shrewd to commit the blunder of saying any thing like what is falsely attributed to him, or to disclose such an ulterior purpose. We may say as much of the sentiment attributed to the archbishop of St. Louis. The archbishop never uttered or entertained it. Something like what is ascribed to him was said, many years ago, by Mr. Bakewell, in *The Shepherd of the Valley*, a paper published at St. Louis, but he was assailed by the Catholic press all over the country, and if he did not retract it, at least endeavored to explain it away, and to show that he meant no such thing. The archbishop never said it, and was no more responsible for it than was the Rabbi Lilienthal himself. No Catholic prelate and no distinguished Catholic layman even has ever proposed any amendment to the constitution in regard to the relations of the church and state in this country, or has expressed any wish to have the existing constitutional relations changed, or in any respect modified. The church is satisfied with them, and only asks that they be faithfully observed. She opposes the separation of church and state in the sense of releasing the state from all moral and religious obligations, for that would imply the subjection of the church to the state, and prove the grave of religious freedom and independence, which she always and everywhere asserts with all her energy against kings, emperors, nobilities and peoples —against Jew, pagan, Mussulman, schismatic, and heretic, and it is for this that they conspire against her and seek her destruction.

The rabbi says, "First the state, then the church," which is as absurd as to say, "First man, then God." The state represents simply a human authority, while the church, or the synagogue even, represents—the first for the Catholic, the second for the Jew—the sovereignty of God, or the divine authority in human affairs, and the rabbi in his doctrine is false alike to Moses and to Christ, and as little of an or-

thodox Jew as he is of a Christian believer. Yet he agrees perfectly with Judge Hurlbut and Dr. Bellows in asserting the supremacy of the state or secular order, and the subordination of the spiritual order. We do not know whether the rabbi means to approve or censure the assumption by Peter the Great of the headship of the Russian Church, and his government of it by the sword; but Peter only acted on the principle, "First the state, then the church," and the slavery of the Russian church to the state is only an inevitable consequence of that principle or maxim. The Russian church, governed by the holy synod, itself governed by the czar, presents a lively image of the abject position religion would be compelled to hold in every country if the doctrine of the total separation of church and state, and he independence and supremacy of the state, advocated by one or another of the three men we are criticising, were to prevail and to be embodied in the civil code.

But let this pass. It is clear that the rabbi, and therefore the Jews, so far as he represents them, are to be included in the great conspiracy against the liberty and equality of Catholics, or religious liberty recognized and guarantied by the American states. Catholics are to be put down and their church suppressed by the strong arm of power. To prepare the American people for this proposed revolution in the American system, this suppression of religious liberty, a system of gross misrepresentation of Catholic faith and practice, of misstatements, calumnious charges, and downright lying respecting the church, is resorted to and persisted in as it was by the reformers in the sixteenth century. "Lie, lie stoutly," Voltaire said, though it was said long before him; "something will stick." We do not like to say this, but truth will not permit us to soften our statement or to use milder terms. There is nothing too harsh or too false for the anti-Catholic press and the anti-Catholic preachers and lecturers to say of our holy religion, and nothing can be more unlike the Catholic Church than their pretended representations of her—too unlike, indeed, even to be called caricatures, for they catch not one of her features. Even when the anti-Catholic writers and speakers tell facts about Catholics or in the history of the church, they so tell them as to distort the truth and to produce the effect of falsehood, or draw inferences from them wholly unwarranted. We must, then, be excused if we sometimes call the systematic misrepresentation of our religion, our

church, and ourselves by its true and expressive name, even though it may seem harsh and impolite. The batteries they discharge against the church are not to be silenced by bouquets of roses.

The public has become too well informed as to Catholic doctrines and usages to permit the repetition, with much effect, of many of the old charges and calumnies. Only the very ignorant can be made to believe that the church is the Babylonian sorceress who makes the nations drunk with the wine of her fornications; that she is "the mystery of iniquity;" that the pope is the man of sin," or Antichrist; that our nunneries are brothels, and their vaults are filled with the skeletons of murdered infants, of which Luther discoursed to his friends with so much unction in his Tischreden over his pot of beer. These things are a little out of date and do not gain the ready credence they once did. The age is all for liberty, for progress, for enlightenment; so the anti-Catholic tactics change to suit the times. James I. of England, as did the politicians of France opposed to the Ligue, charged the church with being hostile to monarchy and the divine right of kings. The charge now is that she is opposed to republicanism, and denies the divine right of the people, or, more strictly, of the demagogues. She is said to be a spiritual despotism, the foster-mother of ignorance and superstition, the enemy of science and of progress, of intelligence and liberty, individual and social, civil and religious. Her religious houses are dens of cruelty and tyranny, and if she is permitted to continue and spread her peculiar institutions over this country, American democracy will be destroyed, and American liberty be but a memory, &c., &c.

The cry is not now, the truth is in danger, the Gospel is in danger, religion is in danger, but the republic is in danger, democracy is in danger, liberty is in danger. The church, the moment she gets the power, will, it is argued, abolish our political system, establish a monarchy, abolish religious liberty, and cut the throats of all heretics and infidels, or send them to the stake to be consumed in a fire of green wood, as Calvin did Michael Servetus. And there are not wanting fools enough to believe it or dishonest men enough to pretend to believe it when they do not, though it is evident that the republic is likely to pass away, if things go on in the political world as they are now going, and be succeeded by anarchy or a military despotism long

before the majority of the people will cease to war against the church as anti-democratic. But the point to be noted here is that all these charges assume the supremacy of the secular order, and allege not that the church is false, is not the church of God, but that she is hostile to democracy or democratic institutions; in other words, that she does not conform to popular opinion, for democracy is nothing but popular opinion erected into law. Now, as we do not believe that popular opinion, inconstant as the wind, is infallible, or that the secular order is supreme, we are not sure that it would be a fatal objection to the church even if what is alleged against her were well founded. The arguments against the church of this sort are drawn from too low a level to command any intelligent respect, and they are all based on a false assumption. Politics are not higher than religion; the state is not above the church; the secular order is not above the spiritual; and it is only atheism that can assert the contrary. To a terrible extent, the supremacy of the secular is the doctrine of our age and country; but Catholics hold it to be both false and dangerous, as incompatible with the liberty and independence of religion, with natural morality, and even with the existence of natural society, as it is with the sovereignty of God. It is the doctrine of the European revolutionists and communists, and is sapping the life and threatening the very existence of our American republicanism—has already reduced our government to be little else than an agency for promoting the private interests of business men, bankers, manufacturers, and railroad corporations. Our elections are becoming a wretched farce, for the monopolists govern the government, let what party may succeed at the polls. The state governments cannot control them, and the general government just as little.

We will not so dishonor the church or insult religion as to undertake to refute these popular charges against her, and to prove that her authority is not incompatible with the existence and salutary working of republican government. The charges are addressed to ignorance and prejudice; we take higher ground, and maintain that civil society can no more dispense with the church, than the body with the soul. The secular is insufficient for itself, and needs the informing life and vigor of the spiritual. The political history of France since 1682, especially since 1789, proves it to all men who are capable of tracing effects to

their causes. There is no form of government more in need of the church than the republican, founded on the modern doctrine of popular sovereignty, and the maxim, the majority must rule. The habit of regarding power as emanating from the mass, as derived from low to high, tends itself to debase the mind, to destroy that respect for law, and that reverence for authority, without which no government performs in a peaceable and orderly way its legitimate functions. The American people see nothing divine, nothing sacred and inviolable, in their government; they regard law as an emanation of their own will, as their own creation, and what creator can feel himself bound to reverence and obey his own creature? We need the church to consecrate the government, to give the law a spiritual sanction, to create in us habits of reverence, of submission, and docility, and to impress us with the conviction that civil obedience is a moral duty, and that we must be loyal to legitimate authority for conscience' sake. We need the church to teach us that in obeying the laws not repugnant to the divine law, we are obeying not men, which is slavery, but God, which is freedom, and the very principle of all freedom. We need her to create in us high and holy aspirations, to produce in us those high and disinterested virtues, without which civil government is impotent for good, and powerful only for evil. No man who believes not in the sovereignty of truth, in the supremacy of right, and feels it not his duty to obey it at all hazards, has the temper demanded in a republic, and only the church can create it.

A government built on interest, however enlightened, on sentiment, however charming, or public opinion, however just, is a house built on the sand. It rests on nothing fixed and permanent, is without stability or efficiency, and tends always to fall and bury the people in its ruins. We see this in our own political history. It would be difficult to find a government more corrupt than ours, that taxes the people more heavily, or that does less for the public good, the advantages we had at the start being taken into the account. The good that has been done, the great things accomplished, have been accomplished by the people in spite of the government, and our record as a nation can hardly put that of Prussia or Russia to shame.

We do not choose to dwell on this aspect of the case, although much more might be said. We love our country, have been bred to love republicanism, and have the success

of the American experiment at heart. The evils which the liberals charge to the union of church and state, and hold the church responsible for, spring, as every impartial and intelligent student of history knows, not from the union but from the separation of church and state, and the unremitting efforts of the civil power to usurp the functions of the spiritual power, and to make the church the accomplice of its policy. The terrible struggles of the pope and emperor in the middle ages had this cause and no other. The pope simply sought to maintain against the emperor the freedom and independence of the church, the kingdom of God on earth, that is, true religious liberty. It is to the partial, in some countries the complete, triumph of the secular over the spiritual, that we must attribute the unsettled, disorderly, and revolutionary state of contemporary society throughout the civilized world, the hatred or contempt of authority both divine and human, the depression of religion, the decline of intellectual greatness, the substitution of opinion for faith, a sickly sentimentalism for a manly and robust piety, free-lovism or divorce *ad libitum* for Christian marriage, and the general abasement of character.

The evils are very real, but the more perfect divorce of the state from the church would not cure or lessen, but only aggravate and intensify them; nay, would to all human foresight render them incurable. The state without religion or moral obligation is impotent to redress social evils or to elevate society, and Protestantism, which holds from the people, and depends for its very breath of life on popular opinion, is no less impotent than the state. Protestantism, having retained some elements of religion from the church, may, we readily concede, do something to retard the fall of a nation that accepts it, but when a Protestant nation has once fallen, become morally and politically corrupt, rotten to the core, it has no power to restore it; for it has no principle of life to infuse into it above and beyond that which it already has. Resting on human authority, holding from the nation or people, its life is only the national life itself; and, of course, when the national life grows weak, its own life grows weak, and when the national life is extinct, its own life becomes extinct with it. Cut off from the church of God, and therefore from Him who is "the way, the truth, and the life," it cannot draw new supplies of life from the fountain of life itself, with which to revive and reinvigorate the fallen nation.

This is wherefore there is no hope for our republic under Protestantism. There has been a sad falling-off in the virtue, the honesty, the integrity, the chastity, and public spirit of our people in the last fifty years. The old habits formed under Catholic discipline and influences are wearing out, if not worn out; intellectual culture may be more general, though even that may be questioned, but it is less generous, thorough, and profound; meeting-houses may be increased in greater proportion than the population itself, but theology is less studied—is less intellectual, less scientific, and is more superficial; and religion has less hold on the conscience, and less influence on life, public, private, or domestic; and we may say, generally, that in all save what belongs to the material order, our republic has a downward tendency. Now, since Protestantism has nothing more or higher than the republic, and no recuperative power, how, then, can it possibly arrest this downward tendency and turn it upward, and save the nation? Archimedes wanted something whereon to stand outside of the world in order to move it. This Protestantism has not, for it rests on the world, and has nothing above the world or outside of it, and in fact is only the world itself. To every one who understands the great law of mechanic force, which has its analogue in the great principle of moral or spiritual dynamics, it is clear that the hope of the republic is not and cannot be in Protestantism, and there is just as little in the civil order, for that, divorced from the church and without any moral obligation, is precisely that which needs saving. The union of the various Protestant sects in one organic body, if it were possible, would avail nothing; for the whole would be only the sum of the parts, and the parts having no supramundane life, the whole could have none.

Hence we say that whatever hope there is for our republic is in the growth and predominance of the Catholic Church in the minds and hearts of the American people; and there is a well-grounded hope for it only in the prospect that she may before it is too late become the church of the great majority. The church has what Archimedes wanted, and Protestantism has not—the whereon to stand outside and above the world. She lives a life which is not derived from the life of the world, and is in communion with the Source of life itself, whence she may be constantly drawing fresh supplies, and infusing into the nation a life above the national life in its best estate, and which, infused into the

nation, becomes for it a recuperative energy, and enables it to arrest its downward tendency, and to ascend to a new and higher life. It is not without a reason, then, founded in the nature of things, that we tell our countrymen that Protestantism may ruin the republic, but cannot save it, any more than it can the soul of the individual; and that, instead of crying out against the church like madmen, as hostile to the republic, they should rather turn their eyes toward her as their only source of help, and learn that she can and will save the republic, if they will only allow her to do it.

Yet we urge not this as the motive for accepting the teaching of the church and submitting to her authority and discipline. Our Lord says to us, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you," but he does not bid us or permit us to seek the kingdom of God and his justice for the sake of "these things," or the *adjicienda;* he forbids us to be solicitous for them, since it is for them that the heathen are solicitous. The only motive for a man to become a Catholic, to believe what the church teaches, and to do what she commands, is that she is the kingdom of God on earth, and that it is only in so doing that he can possess "his justice," please God or attain to eternal life. Christ did not come, as a temporal prince, to found—as the carnal Jews, misinterpreting the prophecies, expected—an earthly kingdom, or to create an earthly paradise; but he came as a spiritual prince to establish the reign of his Father on earth in all human affairs, and over all men and nations, and whatever temporal good is secured is not the end or reason of his kingdom, but is simply incidental to it. It is no reason why I should or should not be a Catholic because the church favors or does not favor one or another particular theory or constitution of civil government, but the fact that she does not favor a particular form of civil polity, if it be a fact, is sufficient reason why I should not favor it, for it proves that such form is repugnant to the sovereignty of God and the supremacy of his law. As a matter of fact, however, the church has never condemned any particular form of civil polity or erected one form or another into a Catholic dogma, and a man may be a monarchist, a republican, or a democrat, as he pleases, and at the same time be a good and irreproachable Catholic, if he hold the political power subordinate to the divine sovereignty.

The church is necessary to sustain a republican form of

government, but it is also necessary to sustain any other form, as a wise, just, and efficient civil government. The error of those we are combating is not in that they are democrats or anti-democrats, but in holding that the state or secular order is sufficient for itself, can stand of itself without the aid of religion or the church, has no need of the spiritual, and has in fact the right to brush religion aside as an impertinent intermeddler whenever it comes in its way, or seeks to dictate or influence its policy. This is a gross error, condemned by all religion, all philosophy, and all experience. It is the old Epicurean error that excludes the divine authority from the direction or control of human affairs, and in its delirium sings,

"Let the gods go to sleep up above us."

It is at bottom pure atheism, nothing more, nothing less. It is a pure absurdity. Can the creation stand without the Creator? Can the contingent subsist without the necessary? Can the body live and perform its functions without the soul which is its principle of life; the dependent without that on which it depends? In the whole history of the world, you will not find an instance of a purely atheistical state, or a state held to be completely divorced from the spiritual order. There is no instance in all history of a state without some sort of religion, even an established religion, or religion which the state recognizes as its supreme law, and does its best or worst to enforce. We here, as well as in England, as well as at any time in any European country, have an established religion which the law protects and enforces on all its citizens, only it is a mutilated religion, a religion without dogmas, and called morality. If not so, whence is it the law punishes murder or arson, and forbids polygamy, or the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes? Even Jacobins erect their Jacobinism into a religion, and make it obligatory on the state to persecute, to exterminate all who dare oppose it. Have we not seen it despoil the Holy See of its independence and possessions, confiscate the goods of the church, exile holy bishops from their sees and their country in Italy, and within a few weeks shoot down the archbishop of Paris and a large number of priests and religious, suspend public worship, desecrate and plunder the churches, and banish all religion but their Jacobinism from the schools? No state tolerates any religion hostile to its own established religion, and the most intolerant and

cruel persecutors in the world are precisely those who clamor loudest for religious liberty.

There is no such thing as a complete divorce of church and state practicable in any country on earth. The only question is, shall the state be informed and directed by the infallible and holy church of God, or by the synagogue of Satan? No man who is at all competent to pass a judgment on the question but agrees with the Syllabus in condemning not the distinction, but the separation of church and state; but the forms of the union of the two powers, whose harmonious action is necessary to the normal state of society, may vary according to circumstances. In countries where the state refuses to recognize frankly and fully the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, it may be necessary to regulate the relation of church and state by concordats; in others, where the state recognizes the independence of the spiritual order, and holds itself bound to protect the rights of the religion adopted by its citizens, as hitherto with us, no concordats are necessary, for the state does not claim any competence in spirituals. In this country the relation between the two powers has, with a few exceptions, been satisfactory, and the church has been free. But there is on foot a formidable conspiracy against her freedom, and it is beginning to be maintained pretty determinedly that the majority of the people, being Protestant, and the people being the state, have the right and the duty as the state to sustain Protestantism, and outlaw and suppress the church.

THE PAPACY AND THE REPUBLIC.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1873.]

James I. of England, in his "Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings and the Independency of their Crowns," in answer to the speech of Cardinal Duperron in the *États Généraux* of France, in 1614, objects to the papacy, and therefore to the Catholic Church, that it is incompatible with kingly government. The pope claimed to be superior to kings, held them subject to his spiritual authority,

and consequently denied the independence of their crowns. This was the great objection to the papacy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Then the papacy was condemned as opposed to monarchy.

The great objection to the papacy now is, and has been, since 1789, that it denies popular sovereignty, and is incompatible with a republican government. Anti-papal journals, pamphlets, preachers, and lecturers, and so-called Christian unions, Evangelical alliances, and other sectarian associations, oppose the spread of the church in our country, on the ground that her predominance here would destroy our free institutions, and prove the grave of civil and religious liberty. The spirit of the age has changed. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was monarchical, and asserted the divine right of kings and passive obedience; now it is, at least in this country, anti-monarchical, proclaims the divine right of the people, or of the demagogues who flatter and use them; and asserts for any faction of the people the "sacred right of insurrection," or of revolution.

Yet the objection, in either form, is one and the same in principle. It is that the secular order is independent, and its representative has no superior on earth; or, rather, that the church, to be the true church of God, must consult and conform to the spirit of the age, give it her blessing, pronounce it sacred, vary as it varies, and never presume to resist it, or to enjoin any thing that contradicts it. The spirit of the age, the *Weltgeist*, as say our German friends, is only another name for the spirit of the world,—"the prince of this world," as says our Lord; or Satan, the adversary of Christ, and the sleepless enemy of souls. The principle, or the assumption of the objection, is inadmissible, for it makes it the duty of the church to conform to the spirit of the age, puts the world in the place of the church as the representative of the spiritual order, and substitutes Satan for God.

To an objection founded on this principle, which is that of gentilism—since, as the Holy Scriptures assure us, "all the gods of the gentiles are devils"—I have no reply, except to say, that none but one who is carried away by the delusions of Satan can entertain it for a moment, and against satanic delusions reason is powerless. I cannot do the dishonor to Jesus Christ, my Lord and my God, whose vicar on earth is the pope, of undertaking to prove that the papacy is compatible with a republican or any other form of civil

government. I take higher ground and assert, that, without the papacy or the Catholic Church, which is essentially papal, the republican or democratic form of government has nothing to stand on, and is and must be an impracticable government. No civil government, be it a monarchy, an aristocracy, a democracy, or any possible combination of any two or all of them, can be a wise, just, efficient, and durable government, governing for the good of the community, without the Catholic Church; and without the papacy there is and can be no Catholic Church. This is true of any civil government, but especially true of a republican or democratic government like ours. This is the ground I take; and to maintain it is the purpose of this article.

The state, however constituted, cannot stand on itself, for *non est potestas nisi a Deo.* God alone is self-existent and self-supporting. It cannot stand on the secular order, for the secular order has not its basis in itself; otherwise it would be the divine order, the only order that is self-sufficing. The state can stand, then, only on God, on a divine or spiritual foundation. Nobody can deny that the state must be founded in right, and have for its law or mission the maintenance of justice, the recognition, protection, and vindication of rights, the rights of man, the rights of conscience, the rights of family, the rights of person and property, of the individual and of society. But justice, all the rights named, are prior to the state or civil society; not created by it, and are obligatory on it. The state does not make them, and cannot unmake them; its duty is to recognize, protect, and defend them, or, as far as in its power, to secure to every one within its jurisdiction their free, full, and peaceable enjoyment. As prior to, and independent of, the state, above it, and its law, they must, since they are not abstractions, pertain to the divine or spiritual order, and be determinable by the divine law, not by human law. The state, then, has its foundation and law in the spiritual order, not in itself, nor in the secular or temporal order. Without the spiritual or divine order, the state has then no basis, no foundation, nothing to stand on, nothing to uphold it; and it cannot but fall through.

But the state being itself secular, in the temporal order, has no competency or jurisdiction in the spiritual; and therefore cannot of itself define the rights it is bound to recognize, protect, and defend. Belonging to the divine or spirit-

ual order, only a divine or spiritual authority is competent to define and declare them. The fact, that these rights are called natural rights, and are conferred by the law of nature, in no sense invalidates this conclusion, but confirms it; for the natural law is the law imposed on nature by its Author, not a law which nature herself makes and imposes on herself. It is the law of God no less than is the revealed law, and therefore is in the divine or spiritual order, being, the theologians tell us, only a transcript of the eternal law; that is, the eternal will, or reason of God, applied to creatures existing in space and time.

What the scientists call natural laws are physical causes, which, by the provision and sustaining power of the Creator execute, as second causes, themselves. But these are very distinguishable from what is called by moralists and theologians, the law of nature—*jus naturale*. They are physical; this is ethical, and applies only to persons or creatures endowed with reason and free will, and capable of moral action, or of acting from choice and *propter finem*, or for the sake of an end foreseen and willed. For physical laws, a creator suffices; but, for an ethical or moral law, a lawgiver is demanded, and a judge or court to define, declare, and apply it. God is the supreme Lawgiver, and men have no legislative power except as authorized or commissioned by him. All men are equal, and therefore no man can, in his own name, bind another; human laws are binding in conscience, only when they are enacted by a legislature authorized by the divine law, and are in accordance with it. Unjust laws are violences rather than law, as says St. Augustine, as says also St. Thomas after him; and human laws, repugnant to the divine law, have no force whatever, and are on no account to be obeyed.

Now, as all laws, as all rights, are spiritual, or divine, and all their vigor as laws is derived from the spiritual order, only a spiritual court, or representative of the divine order, is competent to judge of them, define, declare, and apply them to the practical questions as they come up in individual or social life. This representative of the divine order on earth is the church, instituted by God himself to maintain his law in the government of men and nations. Hence the necessity of the union of church and state; and the condemnation in the Syllabus of those who demand their total separation and the independence of the state.

The majority of the American people have a great horror

of the union of church and state, and hold that in this country the two powers are totally separate; but this is because they understand the union of church and state in a Protestant sense, as it exists in England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, and indeed in all Protestant and schismatic states except our own; and which is not so much a union of church and state, as the subjection of the church to the state. In these Protestant states the church is a state establishment, a creation of the state, and its ministers a branch of the national police. The state determines its faith, discipline, and worship, and it holds from the civil power which governs it, and whose bidding it is bound to do.

In Catholic countries, there is not and never has been any union of church and state in this sense. The state recognizes the church, but does not create it; it receives its faith from the church herself, but has no authority to impose it; and if it has sometimes attempted to interfere with the church in her discipline and worship, or the management of her temporalities, she has always resisted it as an encroachment on her rights, and as an act of tyranny opposed to religious liberty. She holds, not from the civil power, but from God, and is above and independent of the state. The state recognizes her authority, and protects, or is bound to protect, her rights with its physical force, if necessary, against any and every one who would violate them; or, in other words, guaranties her full freedom in faith, worship, discipline, and proprietorship, and professes to govern in accordance with the divine law as she interprets, declares, and applies it.

Excepting the last point named, this is only what the American state recognizes, guaranties, and defends for the church. She has here nearly all the rights guarantied to her, and in some respects more freedom than she secures by her most advantageous concordats with the Catholic powers of Europe or America. She is freer and more independent here, and is more efficiently protected by the constitution of the American republic, than she has ever been in France, since Philip the Fair; in Germany, since the extinction of the Carlovingian emperors; in England, since the Norman conquest; or in Spain, since the death of Isabella the Catholic: although she is not once recognized by name in the constitution, and the fathers of the republic, very likely, had no intention of recognizing or protecting her at all, for they regarded her as dead, and no longer a danger to their

Protestantism or infidelity. There is here a real union of church and state in our sense of the term; and though not perfect, yet almost as perfect as has ever existed anywhere.

The state with us recognizes the independence of the spiritual order, and its own incompetency in spirituals; it acknowledges in reality, if not in form, as its basis, as its very foundation, not only the independence, but the supremacy of the spiritual order; it recognizes what it calls the rights of man, holds them to be inalienable, confesses them to be anterior and superior to itself, and acknowledges itself bound to respect, protect, and defend them. And the courts will pronounce any law repugnant to them, that denies or abridges them, contrary to justice, and therefore null and void from the beginning.

But what are called the rights of man, among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," lie in the spiritual order, and are the rights of God and of man only in that they are the rights of God. Man is God's creature, belongs to God in all he is, in all he has, and in all he can do or acquire. Gods owns him, body and soul, and is his sovereign lord and proprietor. He then has nothing that he can, in strictness, call his own. His rights are necessarily the rights of God. Who does wrong to a man does wrong to God; who oppresses a man oppresses God; who robs a man of any right in him robs God; as he who does a service to a man as the creature of God, be it only to give him a cup of cold water when thirsty, does a service to God. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me." It is because all these rights are the rights of God, that they are sacred and inviolable; and whoso violates any one of them, not only commits a crime against man and society, but a sin against God.

It makes nothing against this conclusion to say, these rights are natural rights, and are held under the natural law. Nature can confer no rights and impose no duties; for it is itself the creature of God, and has no rights of its own; and the natural law, as we have seen, is the law of God, to which nature is subjected. Hence, without God there is no right, no duty; and the attempt to found politics or ethics, without the recognition of the existence of God and the divine sovereignty, is perfectly idle. The heathen who believed in a plurality of gods might find a basis for politics and morals independent of them and their sovereignty, in what they

called justice, and which they held to be anterior and superior to both gods and men, and binding alike on both. But justice, as an idea, is an abstraction; and all abstractions are unreal, and can bind no one. The eternal and sovereign justice—justice in itself, as Plato says, which binds gods and men, and by participation of which all just things, words, or deeds, are just—is inconceivable without an eternal and supreme being, who is being in itself, independent and self-existent, and self-sufficing, who is himself the fountain and measure of justice, and to whom belongs the supreme and universal dominion: therefore, justice is an absurdity if there is no God, or a multitude of independent gods.

In recognizing the inalienable and inviolable rights of men as anterior to it, independent of it, and above it, the American state recognizes the rights of God, and therefore the freedom, independence, and supremacy of the spiritual order. It recognizes the supremacy of that order, in acknowledging its own incompetency in spirituals, and its obligation to respect, protect, and defend these rights. They are the law under which it holds. It is not true, then, that under the American system the state is totally separated from the spiritual order, and independent of it; free to adopt and carry out any policy it judges proper, without consulting it, or without regard to the law of God.

Nor does the state stop here. It recognizes, through the civil courts, the spiritual authority of the church as the representative of the spiritual order on earth; for the canonical judgments of the ecclesiastical courts are final for the civil courts in all questions between the church and her own members. The civil courts will not review them, reverse them, or receive appeals from them. There are, as in France, under the "Organic Articles" appended by the first consul, Bonaparte, on his own authority alone, to the concordat of 1801, no *appels comme d'abus* to the conseil d'état, or any other civil tribunal. The civil courts confess they have no jurisdiction under or over canon law. All they claim the right to do is, to inquire if the judgment of the ecclesiastical court is regular or canonical, that is, in accordance with the ecclesiastical law. If so, and it is a judgment that has temporal effects, they recognize and enforce it as to the temporality.

If, for instance, a refractory, canonically suspended, or excommunicated priest has possession of the parish church, or other ecclesiastical property, and refuses to surrender it

to the bishop of the diocese, whether the bishop is a corporation sole or not, the courts will compel him to surrender it, on the ground that he holds it in violation of the canons of the body to which he belongs, or belonged, when he came into possession of it, and under which alone he could have any claim to it. The decision of the inferior court in Pennsylvania, in the case of Stack against the bishop of Scranton, apparently in contradiction of the rule here asserted, was not so in fact; it was a wrong decision, and has since been overruled by the supreme court on appeal, if I am rightly informed, because it was founded on a misapprehension of the canon law governing the case, in force in the United States.

The civil courts, according to the decision of the supreme court of the United States in the famous Dartmouth College case, and a more recent case touching the proprietorship of a Presbyterian meeting-house in Louisville, Kentucky, on the same principle will protect the church's right of property to her churches, schoolhouses, hospitals, asylums, and all eleemosynary bequests and donations, against any schismatic or separated bodies that may happen to have possession of them, and will recognize her canonical judgments as to what is, or is not, a schismatic or separated body. The original persistent body is the proprietor, and all eleemosynary bequests and gifts follow the will of the donor. It is possible that the bishops, in the beginning, were not fully aware of the protection the law or the courts could afford to the temporalities of the church, and that the rule they adopted in the provincial council was a needless, as well as a cumbersome way of securing to the church the full control and management of them. The courts would not allow ecclesiastical property to be diverted from the purposes intended by the donors, and would declare any statute, diverting it from that purpose, null and void; at least would be bound to do so, as the law now stands.

The church has all the security for her temporalities in the United States that government and law can give. She has her full freedom of teaching, discipline, and worship; and her pastors are not only protected in person and property, but have (what they have seldom had elsewhere) perfect freedom of intercourse in person or by letter with their chief, the Roman pontiff, without being obliged to ask the permission of the civil authority. She needs no *placet* from the state, no preconization of the government, before ap-

pointing and inducting bishops into their sees. She appoints whom she pleases without leave asked or obtained, and invests whom she will with the cure of souls, without the slightest interference of the civil authority; a freedom which even the Roman *curia* can hardly understand, and which they are almost afraid to use.

It is very true that the church enjoys this freedom and security here in common with the sects; but she is none the less free and independent, because the sects are equally free and independent. Their freedom and independence do not detract from hers. That these sects constitute a real danger to the republic, to both civil and religious liberty, there is no doubt; for they, none of them, accept the principle of equal rights on which the republic is founded, or acknowledge the incompetency of the state in spirituals. They would use the state to restrict, and in the end to suppress, the freedom and independence of the church. But since the state has no competency in spirituals, it is not competent to declare that they have no spiritual character, and could not suppress them even if it had; for together they are the majority of the people, and the people with us are the state. The church can use against them only spiritual weapons, and suppress them only so far as she succeeds in converting them. She cannot call on the state to suppress them, because, 1st: The state has no power to do it; because, 2d: That would be to change fundamentally the constitution of the state, and to reject the doctrine of equal rights on which it is founded, and which is her only safeguard for her own freedom and independence; and because, 3d: According to the law of God, as interpreted by the church, faith cannot be forced, but must be voluntary and free.

The church has the right to call upon Christian princes or states to use their power to compel infidel governments, like China, Japan, or Turkey, to permit Catholic missionaries to preach freely the Gospel to their subjects; and their subjects, if converted, to profess and practise freely, or without persecution, the Christian faith; but nothing more. It has also the right to call upon a Catholic state to suppress an insurgent heresy or schism, and to compel those who have personally received the faith, to return to the unity from which they have broken away. This is the full extent of the power she has ever claimed, to call to her aid the secular power against infidelity, heresy, or schism. In a country like ours, or like that of any Protestant state, where

the heresy and schism are of long standing, and have been inherited by the present generation from their fathers, she claims only the power that she claims with regard to infidel or heathen nations; which is only what the state now does, or professes to do, for her in this country. The church, then, even if she wielded the power of the state, could not use it to suppress the sects, or to deprive them of equal freedom and independence with herself. The evil, then, of sectarism, must be borne with, for there is no power to suppress it, except by voluntary conversion.

Yet is there another side to the question. It is not enough for a republic, that the constitution of the state recognizes the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, or even its supremacy; not enough that the church, its representative, or the kingdom of God on earth, is present in it, free and independent in relation to her own members, for they may be a feeble minority, and with little or no practical influence in her government. In our republic the ruling majority of the people are non-Catholics; and even Catholics in their political action hardly differ from their non-Catholic fellow-citizens. Our Catholic politicians act usually, nay, boast that they act, on the principle that their religion has nothing to do with their politics. They have adopted the Gallican error as to the relation of the two powers. They hold that church and state are here, and ought to be everywhere, totally separated, each independent of the other; that is, that the temporal order stands on the same level with the spiritual, and, consequently, that there is nothing in politics in which one is required to be conscientious, and in relation to which the law of God has any thing to say. Were the whole people Catholic, after the manner of these "enlightened and liberal Catholics," the church could do no more to save the republic than she does now, or than she has been able to do to save the state in France, Italy, Spain, Austria, or in the Spanish-American republics. The church is effective in her strength, not when she is shorn of it and turned into an archangel fallen.

The great conservative element in the American democracy, hitherto, has been the common law inherited from our Catholic ancestors, and administered by an independent judiciary; not, as so many foolishly imagine, in the superior virtue, wisdom, and intelligence of the American people, not in the democratic principle itself, nor in any self-adjusting power in the constitution of the republic. The common

law, which is of Catholic origin, or at least was brought to its perfection by Catholic influences ages ago, and administered by a learned and independent judiciary, has hitherto operated as a check on the political passions and vagaries of the people; and while asserting the just rights of authority and the duties of the subject, has thrown out as unconstitutional, or as opposed to the rights of God, much bad legislation; has maintained harmony between public and private, natural and vested rights, and justice between society and the individual, and between man and man. It has protected and vindicated, as perfectly as possible under any system of government, the rights of person and property.

But there is no mistaking the fact, that there is a strong tendency among politicians, and even petty lawyers or attorneys, to destroy both the independence of the judiciary and the efficiency of the common law, and to convert the *lex non scripta* into *lex scripta*, or statute law. Already has it been tampered with both here and in England; its scientific beauty and symmetry have been marred, and its efficiency greatly impaired by statutes overriding it, restricting the remedies, and lessening the security of person and property it originally afforded; and the prospect now is, that it will, under pretence of law reform, be completely reformed away. The New York code of procedure is a specimen of what is to be expected, under which the ablest lawyers are uncertain as to the form in which an action is to be brought or defended. To save ignorant, inept, and indolent attorneys, most of the state legislatures have abolished special pleading, and despoiled the practice of the law of its scientific character; and, as far as possible, destroyed the respectability of the legal profession, by admitting almost everybody, qualified or not, competent or notoriously incompetent, to the practice of law. As if this were not enough to give the climax to the absurdity, some of these legislatures have opened, as several sects have the pulpit, the profession of the law to women.

Above all is to be deplored the war directed against the independence of the judiciary. Formerly our judges were appointed by the executive power of the state, usually by and with the advice and assent of the senate, and held their office for life or during good behavior. But this elevated them above the varying passions of the multitude, and enabled them to judge impartially, without fear or favor.

This did not suit the demagogues, and in my youth I was accustomed to hear it said:—"This will never do. The judges are elevated by their tenure of office above the people, above the reach of public opinion; they are independent of the popular will. We must change this, make our judges elective by the people for short terms of office, and reëligible, so that they may feel their dependence on the people, and be no longer impervious to public sentiment."—As under our system the people are held to be sovereign, this was, therefore, only a revival of the practice so vehemently protested against in the debates that preceded the Declaration of American Independence,—that of judges being appointed by the king and holding their office during his pleasure. The larger number of the states have made their judges elective, for shorter or longer terms of office, and reëligible, and therefore made it their interest to consult popularity instead of justice.

The result has been what might have been foreseen, especially when aided by another absurd doctrine, that makes juries, selected usually for their ignorance and stupidity, judges, in criminal cases, of the law as well as the fact; thus bringing the courts into contempt, making a mockery of justice, and letting most of the big rogues, and not a few of the little rogues, too,—if they have political influence,—escape merited punishment. If the magistrate holds the sword, he seldom with us so wields it as "to be a terror to evil-doers." Innocence is hardly a protection, and guilt hardly a reason for conviction. Hence vice and crime walk abroad at noonday, and become alarmingly prevalent in all ranks and conditions of society. Their daily and hourly increase is truly appalling; and we have cities in the Union which can vie with the "cities of the plain," on which God rained fire from heaven, though, perhaps, there is no one of them which does not contain at least ten just persons, for whose sake the Lord as yet spares them.

Nothing is more certain than that our republic is seriously threatened by the dangerous popular tendencies which not only affect the administration of justice, but our legislation, by daily getting themselves enacted into statutes, and made laws of the land. Government loses its proper character, and becomes simply an agency, the factor of the business classes. Business interests, banking, manufacturing, railroad, and other corporations control it. Congress pays with the bonds of the government the cost of building the Union

Pacific Railroad, and gives the company, in addition, land enough to form half a dozen respectable sovereign principalities; taxes labor to enhance the profits of capital, and studies to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer. The country groaning under a weight of taxation direct and indirect, of national, state, municipal, and corporation debt, nearly equal to its whole assessed value; mortgaged to the future for the benefit of a handful of capitalists and speculators at home and abroad; without an army or a navy; a prey to money-lenders, speculators, stock-jobbers, and gold-gamblers; with fashion, luxury, and extravagance corrupting the whole community and destroying alike private, domestic, and social virtue and morality,—is the net result thus far of democracy with us.

How is the republic to stand, and secure the ends of good government? And where are we to look for a remedy? Not to the people, for they are the party in fault, and that need the remedy. The people are misled by their false theories of religion, politics, and society, by their corrupt passions, evil inclinations, and destructive tendencies. Not to them are we to look. Nor to the state, for with us the people are the state, and the government must follow their will. Our rulers cannot be expected to rise far above the average of the intelligence and virtue of the people who elect them, and whose representatives they are. We cannot look to the press; the press depends on the people, and must conform to their opinions, passions, prejudices, and tendencies, or they will not support it. Besides, the independent press, so called, is the chief corrupter of the people, and we owe to it, and the secular press generally, the low moral tone of the public, the growing religious indifference of the community, the shameless sacrifice of principle to success; truth and justice, wisdom and virtue, to popularity. We might as well look to Satan to correct sin, as to the press to apply a remedy to the growing evils and destructive tendencies of the American people. Not to the sects, whether Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, or Unitarian, can we look for the remedy; for if they ever insist on the supremacy of the spiritual order, it is and can be only as an abstraction, a theory, not as an organic power, a spiritual kingdom on earth with the necessary organs for applying practically the law of God to the maintenance of public and private virtue, without which no government, whatever its form, can stand.

They themselves, though treated as such by the state, are not spiritual organizations, have no spiritual authority, and are only secular organizations, self-constituted societies, or mere voluntary associations, like a temperance, an abolition, or a moral-reform society, with only a human authority and a human virtue. Besides, they must appeal to the very people that need reforming for their power and support, and must take their law from the people instead of giving the law to them. They are powerful only as they are popular.

The people, or popular opinion, in consequence of the lack of authority to define the rights of God, either urge the state to invade them, or disagree as to what they are, and convulse the nation by disputes about them. A few years ago, one section of the people contended vehemently that slavery is a violation of the law, that is, of the rights of God; another section contended, with hardly less vehemence, that it is not a violation of the divine law, but authorized by it, and is, in fact, an eminently Christian institution, beneficial alike to the slave and his master. The dispute waxed so warm, that as there was no recognized authority competent to decide the question, it plunged the nation into a fearful civil war, which lasted four years, cost the nation more than half a million of lives, and not less than seven or eight thousand millions of treasure. A party at the present moment maintains that the use, even in the smallest quantity of any liquor as a beverage that will intoxicate, even of that thin and washy thing called lager bier, is a sin, a violation of the law of God, and calls upon the state to prohibit it by as stringent a law as it can frame; another party, while condemning the abuse, insists that its moderate use is not necessarily a sin; and to prohibit it by civil pains and penalties is tyranny, an invasion of the rights of man, and therefore, of the rights of God. Who is to decide?

Then there is marriage: is it a divine or only a human institution? Some of our people hold it to be the one, others hold it to be the other. Where is the authority to decide? The state has authority only in temporals, and no competency in spirituals; and therefore no competency to decide between the spiritual and the temporal, or to say what is of the domain of the one, and what of the domain of the other. If marriage is a divine institution it pertains to the spiritual order, and its conditions, its rights, and its duties are determined by the law of God, and the state must be governed in its action in regard to it by the de-

cisions of the spiritual authority, which alone is competent to say when it is or is not lawful, to establish *impedimenta dirimentia*, to grant or withhold divorce, to declare its dissolubility or indissolubility. The question of marriage is of the gravest importance, for on it depends the family, and on the family depends society, and ultimately the state itself. Evidently the question is not within the jurisdiction of the temporal power.

Yet the state with us, and with all nations that reject the supremacy of the spiritual authority, assumes its competency in the whole matter, declares marriage a civil contract, and, like any other civil contract, within the jurisdiction of the civil law, which determines the conditions under which the parties concerned may or may not enter into it, and what are the rights and duties created by it. What the civil law makes it can unmake. If it can determine the conditions on which the contract may be made, it may determine the conditions on which it may be unmade or dissolved. Hence, with the non-Catholic American people marriage loses its religious significance, ceases to be sacred, to be as Père Martin says, *res semper sacra;* and hence the basis of the Christian family, therefore Christian society, is undermined by the unwarrantable assumption of spiritual authority by the state. The state, in assuming to determine the question, whether marriage is a divine institution, or simply a civil institution, and in declaring it a purely civil institution, usurps the functions of the spiritual authority, which alone is competent to decide what is spiritual, and what is not.

Understand, then, why this article maintains that, without the church divinely authorized to declare and apply the law of God, and practically to enforce it on states as well as on individuals, our republic cannot stand. Everybody sees that the state cannot stand on the temporal alone; and to clothe it with the spiritual authority, is to make the spiritual itself temporal. The republic cannot subsist without the sacredness and inviolability of marriage, on which depend the sacredness and inviolability of the family; yet without the spiritual as an organized power ever present, declaring and applying the divine law, that sacredness and inviolability cannot be maintained. It is by virtue of the law of God, natural or revealed, that even a civil contract is inviolable. The moral obligation of contracts is imposed by the law of God—for man cannot bind his fellow-men—

and of course is in the spiritual order; and the spiritual authority determines what contracts are or are not lawful, as well as their extent and limitation, when they oblige, and when they do not. Withdraw marriage from the spiritual order, and you leave it without any moral obligation, and relieve its violation from all taint of sin or guilt before God. The spouses are not bound in conscience to mutual fidelity, and may be as unfaithful as they choose, providing they are willing to run the risk of the civil penalties the legislature may impose; for the state cannot itself create a moral obligation, or by its own authority alone bind the conscience.

In consequence of placing marriage in the temporal order, as a mere human or civil institution, men and women, to a fearful extent, have come to regard marriage as imposing no moral obligation of mutual fidelity; and the infidelity of the wife to the husband, or of the husband to the wife, is regarded as a purely civil offence, and, though it may have certain temporal inconveniences, if discovered, is yet held to be no sin or moral wrong. From this it is easy to pass to a doubt of the right of the state to make the infidelity of either spouse even a civil offence. The distance is still less to the denial of its right to bind one man to one woman, or one woman to one man, till separated by death. Here is not only the liberty of divorce *a vinculo* asserted, but the validity of all marriage laws is denied; and free-love, as it is called, defended at least in principle. We are, as a people, rapidly coming to this. Divorce, with liberty to marry again, has become quite common, and for almost any cause, in some of the states, nearly *ad libitum*, and a man or a woman can get divorced simply in order to marry another. Polygamy and polyandry are common in our American society, and even authorized by law.

The evil does not stop here. Children are a great inconvenience in case of frequent divorces, and a great drawback on the love of pleasure that usually prompts the demand for divorce. Hence they must not be allowed to be conceived; or, if conceived, they must not be allowed to be born. Hence methods to prevent conception, and to procure abortion, are invented, made known, and so extensively resorted to, as to tell fearfully on the health of our women, and on the population itself in several of our states. The sexual passions, unrestrained by religion, and fostered by idleness and luxury, and the desire for amusement and dissipation in the well-to-do; and the burden of child-bearing,

and the care and expense of bringing up and providing for a large family of children with the poor—have, to an almost incredible extent, smothered the maternal instinct, and made the prevention of conception, and fœticide, almost general. We no longer meet with those large families of ten, a dozen, or even a score of children, not unfrequently met with two or three generations back. But for the influx of foreigners—with whom our practices, vices, and crimes, have not yet obtained—the census in the older states, instead of an increase, would show an actual decrease of population. This is the testimony of medical men, who have made the subject a special study.

Children with the rich, the well-to-do, and the fashionable, interfere with the mother's pleasures and dissipations; and with the working classes they are a real burden, for the habits and sentiments of American society, are such, especially in cities and large towns, that children cannot, as a general rule, be brought up to work, and to assist their parents in obtaining by their industry an honest livelihood. We have by our factory system and cash payments, broken up and destroyed the "home industry," by which each family produced and manufactured for itself—say, nineteen out of every twenty articles it consumed. Children now will not work, they cannot be made to work; they will run away from home first, and live in the streets or dens by thieving, and form a numerous criminal population for the correctional police, for our penitentiaries, and prisons, the number and magnitude of which is one of the striking features of the land, especially in the eastern and middle, and the earlier-settled western states.

It needs no argument to prove that a republic with these vices and crimes, to say nothing of the dishonesty and fraud in the business world, the untrustworthiness and rascality of men in official life, preying on its vitals, and corrupting its life at its very source, cannot stand. The life of a nation is gone when the purity and the sanctity, the sacredness and inviolability of the family, are no longer maintained, and children are counted a nuisance instead of a blessing. Perhaps no one thing has done so much to corrupt our republic, and to bring it to the verge of ruin, as the abolition of marriage as a religious institution, a sacrament of the New Law under the regulation and supervision of the spiritual authority, and declaring it a simple civil contract, subject to the civil authority alone, and while that civil authority acts independently of the spiritual order. It is corrupting, not only our

own country, but all Europe, except so far as the church is able to arrest its ravages among the faithful. These vices are not peculiar to republicanism, but do and will obtain under any political system that claims to be independent of the spiritual authority.

The state can apply no remedy, and is impotent to arrest the evil that threatens its very existence, because the state here depends on the people, and it is the people themselves, as I have said, that are in fault. A popular government, like ours, can be only the exponent of the popular will and sentiments, only of the virtues and vices of the people. When the people have cast off the law of God, are carried away by false notions and morally destructive theories, and have become corrupt in both theory and practice, the government, holding as it does from them, is necessarily impotent to reform them, to recall them to truth and virtue, and maintain among them the supremacy of right and justice. The American state, if separated from the church of God, assumes the divinity of the people, puts them in the place of the church, and supposes them to be both infallible and impeccable; which, unhappily, is by no means the fact, whatever the demagogues may say in order to deceive them. The people are no more infallible or impeccable collectively, than men and women are individually.

To appeal from the state or government to the people, as our journals do, is absurd; for not only are the people in fault, but in a democracy they are themselves the state, and the government is always as wise, pure, just, and virtuous as they are, and not seldom even more so. To appeal from it to them may be to appeal from the higher to the lower, but never from the lower to the higher. The constitution, and even the laws are far better with us than the people; and it is only the laws demanded by the people or the dominant public sentiment, that are unwise, unjust, corrupt, and corrupting. The constitution and the common law, as we have seen, recognize the supremacy of the spiritual order and the subordination of the temporal. But the people, led away by their passions, by greedy or ambitious demagogues, and by the various sects into which they are divided, which hold from and are sustained by them, and which, therefore, are themselves in the temporal order, and in no sense represent the spiritual order, or have any spiritual authority, will not suffer the state to keep in its action within its own order or constitutional limits, within which it is independent and supreme,—for though its order is

subordinated to the spiritual, yet within its order it has no superior,—but constantly force it to usurp spiritual functions, to define and apply the law of God for itself, by its own authority alone, and thus to violate both civil and religious liberty.

At the moment I am writing, the various sects constituting the majority—and that the ruling majority of the American people—forgetful of the fundamental law of the state, are banding together, and using all the means in their power to force the government, under one pretext or another, to usurp spiritual functions and to assert the supremacy of the temporal in face of the spiritual. Such is the movement to amend the constitution of the United States, so as to give the sects authority ultimately to establish their religion, and to disfranchise and outlaw all who refuse to accept it. Such is the new movement for a national compulsory system of education, which will necessarily be either sectarian or purely secular; in either case, an unchristian education. Such also is their effort to sustain in each of the states public schools at the public expense, to which a respectable minority cannot with a good conscience send their children. They strive to give the state absolute control over the education of the young, trusting themselves to be able always to control the state. The supremacy of the temporal is their principle; for they, counting for nothing in the spiritual order, have, and can have, only temporal authority.

The remedy for the vices of our democratic society, the most generally approved, is education. But the people cannot educate above their own level; and whether they will or not, the education they give through the state will only reproduce themselves, and be marred by their own vices and errors. The majority of the American people will sustain only sectarian or secular schools, and in such schools they can really educate only for the secular order, and train children and youth either in a false religion or in no religion at all, and therefore to be either fanatics or atheists. The stream cannot rise above the fountain, and you cannot get from the people what is not in them. Education can aid in remedying the evils, if it be under the direction of the church of God, and educate the child in reference to the end for which God makes us, and fit him for the performance of his duties in life, and for immortality. But, after all, it is but little that education can do—even the best education possible—in a corrupt society. Children are not educated in the schoolroom

alone. They are educated in the bosom of the family; in the streets; by the general tone of the society in which they are brought up; by their companions and associates. The general character and conduct of the pupils of our parochial schools, and the students and graduates of our Catholic colleges, are hardly above those of the pupils of the public schools, or the students and graduates of non-Catholic colleges; and when they grow up and enter political life, are rarely distinguishable from them. This shows that character is formed far less in the schoolroom, and by tutors and professors, than by the general tone and character of the society in which children are brought up; which, in turn, shows that the tone and character of society are not to be changed by education. They must be corrected before the education can be made what it should be. Education, then, is not, and cannot be, the remedy, nor supply it. In a country like ours, which is almost completely secularized, the reliance must be on the missionary rather than the schoolmaster.

The constitution of the American state needs no change; nor do the laws, with very few exceptions (chiefly those relating to marriage and divorce), need much alteration. What the state needs, is a spiritual authority above and independent of it, competent to define what are or are not the rights of men, that is, the rights of God, and to enforce through the conscience of the people respect for them and obedience to them. If the American people had been Catholics, Catholic in principle as well as in name, papists, and not simply citizens who hold politics are independent of religion and not subject to the law of God, they would never have compelled nor suffered the state to usurp spiritual functions; and few, if any of the evils that impair the efficiency of our government, even threaten the very existence of the civil and religious liberty it professes to guaranty, could ever have occurred. Neither secularism nor sectarianism could have controlled legislation. The state would have confined itself to its own order, and taken the definition of the rights and powers of the spiritual order from the church.

For a Catholic people recognizing the supremacy of the spiritual order and the church as its representative in human affairs, a republican government is a good government; perhaps the wisest and best of all possible governments. But without the Catholic Church, as the church of the people,

to supply the power which the constitution presupposes or needs to secure its practical efficiency, it is, as our American experiment is proving, an impracticable government; is, as I maintained thirty years ago in the *Democratic Review*, tantamount to no government at all. Under a democracy the people govern; but what governs the people? What prevents the people from willing and enacting injustice, or the special interests of certain classes from controlling or misleading the people and their representatives, and making the government their factor as is really the case already in our republic? The government with us is controlled by special interests, and really taxes the whole people for the special benefit of the few, in violation of all right and equity.

It is a commonplace, and has been from the beginning, with our statesmen, that our republic cannot stand without the intelligence of the people, nor with it even, without religion and morality. But a religion or a morality, that holds from the people and varies as their opinions vary, is only their view of religion and morality, and is no power independent of them, and competent to control them, or to maintain for them the authority of the spiritual order. The religion or morality that can save republicanism by subjecting the people to the divine law, and through them force the government to govern in subordination to the spiritual order —that is, right, truth, and justice—must be from above, not from below; hold from God, not from the people; be independent of them, and govern them instead of being governed by them. It must be an organic power, a spiritual kingdom, with its own laws, discipline, and administrative organs, divinely instituted, supported, protected, and assisted; not a simple doctrine, idea, theory, view, or opinion, which has no life or force except what it derives from the subject believing or entertaining it. The only religion or morality of this sort that there is, or even claims to be, is the Catholic Church, of which the pope, successor of Peter, and vicar of Christ, is the supreme governor and infallible teacher. It is, therefore, I maintain, that without this One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, the church of the creed, as the church of the American people, or the major part of them, our republic cannot stand, or our civil and religious liberty be preserved.

The state is secular, and the secular, as we have seen, cannot stand on itself. It cannot any more exist without the

spiritual as an ever-present and active power, defining and administering for it the law of God, than the body can exist and perform its normal functions without the soul. The people do not and cannot give this power, for they are in the same order with the state, are human, and can give only a human authority. The sects in no sense are above the state or the people. They are human in their origin, and have at best only a human authority. The union of the state with any sect, be it the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Episcopalian, the Lutheran, or the Unitarian, would add nothing spiritual to it, would supply no spiritual authority, for any and all of these are as incompetent in spirituals as is the state itself. Their control of the state, or influence through the people on its policy or its acts, would be only the influence or control of the temporal over the temporal. The sects stand even below the level of the state. The state, legitimately constituted, and in the lawful exercise of its powers, is to be obeyed for conscience' sake, because so God ordains; but a sect has and can have no legitimate human authority even, for there can be no human authority against the divine, and the human has no authority in spirituals. The sect has no authority either in spirituals or temporals, while the state has authority, and no superior in its own order, though its order has a superior in the spiritual order.

The sects, so far from furnishing the religious authority needed for the safety of the republic, are themselves the principal sources of danger to it, and against which the church is needed to protect it. Their assumption of spiritual authority, or pretension to count for something in the spiritual order, when in fact they count for nothing in that order, imposes on the people, misleads, perverts them, and moves them to force the government to usurp spiritual functions, and to violate the principle of equal rights, on which our republic is founded, and on which it must stand if it stands at all. This follows from the fact that all sects, when not created by the civil power, which has no authority to create or establish a sect, are simply self-constituted societies or voluntary associations, and represent no authority but that of the views, and sentiments, or opinions of the individuals voluntarily associated. They are all, comparatively speaking, of yesterday, are outside of the apostolic church, and severed from the body of Christ; they are fallible by their own confession, and consequently are unable to speak

with the voice of the Holy Ghost; for the Holy Ghost is the spirit of truth, and can neither err nor authorize error. A fallible church is simply no church at all, that is, no church of God, instituted, commissioned, or assisted by him; it may be a man-made church or synagogue of Satan, but nothing more or better.

It matters nothing to the present argument, that the sects hold more or less of truth, insist with more or less earnestness on the practice of some of the precepts of the Gospel, and call themselves by the name of Christ. Our Lord says: "Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and done many wonderful works in thy name? And then will I profess unto them, *I never knew you:* depart from me, you that work iniquity." The question is, not what they preach or profess, but are they affiliated to the body of Christ, living his life, and acting by his authority. Nor does it matter that they have the Holy Scriptures, the inspired, authoritative, and infallible word of God, since they are no legally constituted court to keep, interpret, and administer the law written in them. They have no authority as a court, and can pronounce no legal sentence, any more than can the famous Judge Lynch.

The state and the sects having no spiritual authority, and being incompetent to pronounce any valid spiritual judgment, or to define the rights which are the basis of the state, which it must hold sacred and inviolable, and which it is its chief duty to recognize, protect, and defend against all aggressors, it must be concluded, either that God has instituted no spiritual kingdom on earth to maintain and apply his law in the government of men and nations; or else that the kingdom he has instituted is the Catholic Church, of which the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, is, by divine right, the supreme governor, and, by the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, the infallible teacher of the universal church.

The former, no man who believes in Christ at all can pretend; and it would not comport with the character of divine providence to suppose that God has made civil society necessary, and yet left us without any adequate means of maintaining it. Only the latter, then, is admissible, and that must be admitted, because the church is manifestly the only means provided. She is the kingdom of God on earth, and, if accepted by the people in her unity and integrity, is am-

ply able to supply precisely what the state has not in itself, but absolutely needs for its maintenance; and to enable it to save alike the cause of order and of freedom, and to save society alike from anarchy and despotism.

The sects all object to the church as a spiritual kingdom above, over, and independent of secular government and the whole secular order. They do not care much what doctrines she preaches, or what practices she observes; they can swallow every thing except her authority as the kingdom of God on earth, as is seen in the joy with which they accept Döllinger and his associates. What they oppose—and the only thing they really oppose—is the papacy; and they would not oppose even that, if the pope claimed only a primacy of order, and not a primacy of jurisdiction. The thing they oppose is spiritual authority really and effectively represented. They have no objection to asserting the dominion of God, the universal sovereignty of Jesus Christ, the supremacy of the spiritual order and the subordination of the temporal, provided you assert no representative of that sovereignty, and defend no divinely instituted and protected organic power capable effectively of asserting and maintaining that supremacy and that subordination. Do that, and they are one and all up in arms against you. This is perfectly natural, for the sects love their own opinions more than they love truth, and prefer following their own will to obedience to the law of God. They are in the temporal order, and if you effectively assert the supremacy of the spiritual, you take from them the power of usurping, or of inducing the state to usurp, spiritual functions, and reduce them to nothing in the temporal order as they are in the spiritual order.

The sects, then, only act according to their nature, in opposing, by all the means in their power, the spread of Catholicity in this country, because, just in proportion as the people become Catholics and recognize the papal supremacy, the power of the sects necessarily decreases, and they lose their control over the state and their prestige with the public. As yet they are the ruling majority, and they are making desperate effort to combine and maintain the supremacy of the temporal in both spirituals and temporals. They are not unlikely to succeed, for a time at least, since they hate one another far less than they hate the church, and Pilate and Herod are agreed and become friends when the question is of crucifying the Lord of life. But, as we have seen,

their success would be the subjection of the spiritual, the ruin of the republic, and the total loss of civil and religious liberty, possible only in a state that governs only in subordination to the spiritual order, or the law of God applicable to human affairs.

The predominance of the Catholic Church in the conviction and faith of the American people would undoubtedly deprive the sects of their present power, and probably would lead ultimately to their extinction; not because the church would use the physical power of the state against them, but because the people would gradually abandon them, and leave them to die of inanition. The sects cannot flourish or even live in a nation that acknowledges the sovereignty of Jesus Christ, that maintains the freedom, independence, and authority of the law of God, and confines the state within the limits of the temporal order. But this is no objection; for the extinction of the sects by conversion to the church is the salvation, not the extinction of the republic; if effected by conviction, and not by violence, it would be, not the destruction of our free institutions, as the sects pretend, but the removal of their worst enemy and greatest possible danger, since secularism is only sectarianism developed. Patriotism, republicanism, democracy is safe, civil and religious liberty guarantied, wherever the people are truly Catholic; and that they have no security when the people are non-Catholics, or only Gallican and universitarian Catholics, has been sufficiently shown.

Some of the nations that separated from the church have some degree—a high degree, if you insist—of national prosperity and temporal grandeur; but none of them have risen in either respect to the height of once renowned pagan nations that have passed away and left only ruins to mark the site where they once stood. The Catholic nations that separated the two powers, and declared—while professing to be Catholic, and dragooning heretics into the adoption of the Catholic faith, or exiling them to foreign lands—the temporal independent in face of the spiritual, have shamefully fallen, and fallen so low that no decent man would do them reverence; in France, Austria, Italy, Spain, as well as Spanish America, they have reaped, or are reaping, the fruit of their error in faith and blunders in politics, and verifying the assertion of Holy Writ: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." If the American people are wise in time, abandon sectarianism

and secularism, and return to the Lord, and submit to his vicar, there is hope for them; if not, there is none. They must go the way of the nations that turned away from God and would not have him to reign over them.

THE DOELLINGERITES, NATIONALISTS, AND THE PAPACY.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1873.]

Our Lord built his church on Peter; and the supremacy in governing, and infallibility in teaching the universal church of Peter in his successors, the Roman pontiffs, have always been held and acted on by the church in all ages and nations as the fundamental principle of her constitution, and the law given her by her divine Founder. The Council of the Vatican has imposed no new faith; it has only defined what has been the faith from the beginning. It matters nothing that the faith on these points had not been explicitly defined from the beginning, for the church defines no point of faith till it is litigated, and in her capacity of *ecclesia judicans;* and even then ordinarily only in condemning and anathematizing the error or errors opposed to it, and she is her own judge of the time and manner of doing it.

The history of the church would be utterly inexplicable without the recognition of the pope as supreme governor and infallible teacher of the whole body of the faithful, or without recognizing at least that such is and always has been the faith of the church. How, otherwise, explain the fact that no assembly of bishops, however numerous, was ever held to be an œcumenical council unless convoked by the authority of the Roman pontiff, presided over by himself in person or by his legates, and its acts approved by him? The schismatic Greeks confess even to-day their inability to hold an œcumenical council, because no council can be œcumenical until it is presided over, and its acts approved, as they say, by the archbishop of old Rome. We know that as early as the second century, if my memory is not in fault, the heathen urged against the church the very objection

urged in our own days in Germany, England, and our own country: that she is dangerous to the empire, because Christians, being united under one supreme ruler, make that ruler a formidable rival to Cæsar. Whence came such an objection, if it was not well known that the church everywhere recognized the Roman pontiff as her supreme ruler or governor under Christ, her invisible head?

The heretics urged, at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third century, the same charges against the bishops of Rome, and accused them of the arrogance and usurpations, that do the Anglicans and Episcopalians of our times. Dr. Döllinger himself shows in his "Hippolytus und Kallistus," that the *Philosophoumena* was written by a heretic who was the contemporary of St. Zephyrinus and his immediate successor, St. Callistus, and who flourished between 180 and 231. From the *Philosophoumena*, he proves that the papacy was as fully constituted at that epoch as it has been at any time since, and that the Roman pontiffs claimed and exercised all the authority in governing and teaching the universal church, claimed for them by either the Council of Florence in 1439, or by the Council of the Vatican in 1870. The same has been shown still more conclusively from the same heretical work, by the late Abbé Cruice. Even Tertullian, after his fall, implies the same in his sneer at the Roman pontiff for claiming to be "the bishop of bishops." The testimony here, as in the case of the heathen, is unimpeachable, for it is the testimony of an enemy to the papacy, who wished to depreciate, not exalt, the papal authority. If the papal power was claimed and exercised at so early a period, within less than a lifetime after the death of the last of the apostles, it evidently must have been founded in the original apostolic constitution of the church. It appears fully recognized and in full operation at too early a day, to have been a corruption, a usurpation, or a development. If the constitution of the church was papal at the end of the second century, it must have been so at the end of the first century when St. John died, and then so from the beginning.

We disposed of the theory of development in a former series of the *Review*, and our view was confirmed by the action of the bishops,—with the acquiescence, to say the least, of the Holy Father,—assembled at Rome on the occasion of the definition by the supreme pontiff of the immaculate conception of the ever blessed virgin mother of God. The

bull preceding the definition, originally presented for the consideration of the bishops assembled, recognized the theory of development; but after their criticism it was withdrawn by the Holy Father, and another, the one published, was drawn up and presented, which excludes that theory. Dr. Ward of the *Dublin Review*, we must therefore believe, is mistaken in asserting that it is now accepted by the church as Catholic doctrine. The reverse is the fact. The attempt of certain theologians to foist it upon the church, has signally failed. The papacy cannot be a corruption, for there is no imaginable element of the constitution of the church, if it is denied, of which it could be a corruption any more than a development. The papal authority, whether as ruler or teacher, either was or was not founded in the apostolic church, and therefore could only be simply affirmed or denied. There was and could be no chance either for development or corruption in the case.

The most generally approved theory among the heterodox is, that the power claimed and exercised by the popes in mediæval and modern times is a usurpation which they have been enabled to effect by the aid of the civil power. But they certainly could derive no aid from the civil power prior to Constantine; for, prior to him, that power was hostile to the popes, doomed them to death, sought to suppress the church, and to extirpate Christianity from the empire. After the conversion of Constantine and the peace of the church, and even for some time before, the seat of the civil power was transferred to the East; and under Constantine, from Rome to Byzantium, which became Constantinople, or the new Rome, and sought to exalt the bishop of that city, not of Rome, which ceased to be the permanent residence of the imperial court or the imperial capital. The interest of the civil authority of the empire was henceforth to enlarge the power of the bishop of new Rome, not of old Rome; and the imperial influence, after a long struggle, did succeed in raising the bishop of Byzantium,—originally a simple suffragan see of Heraclea,—to be patriarch of Constantinople, taking precedence of Antioch and Alexandria, ranking immediately after the bishop of the see of Rome. Here was an obvious case of usurpation, effected in violation of the apostolic canons and the traditions of the fathers, by the aid of the civil power, but not a usurpation in favor of the pope.

Now, if there was no tradition or law that the primacy

belonged to the successor of Peter in the chair of Rome why did the usurpation stop at the *second place* for the courtly and ambitious prelates of Constantinople, instead of grasping the first? Yet neither the emperor nor the bishop of Constantinople, backed by all the power of the empire, ever dared aspire so high, or take precedence in jurisdiction, or in order, of the unarmed and—humanly speaking—defenceless bishop of Rome? The fact is inexplicable, except on the ground that the East as well as the West recognized, as the law of Christ, the supremacy of the successor of Peter in the Roman see. Nothing else could have checked the usurpation, for the civil power was not wielded by the Roman pontiff, but was wielded by the patriarch of Constantinople.

There is another objection to this favorite theory of usurpation. The papal supremacy means supremacy over patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, as well as over the lower orders of the clergy and the laity of the universal church. It is fair to assume that each bishop would have as strong an inclination to resist the papal usurpation, as the pope could have to usurp power. How, then, was the bishop of Rome, starting on a footing of equality in rank and power with his episcopal brethren, with no pre-eminence by divine appointment or the apostolic constitution of the church over them, able to force them to submit to his supreme authority, and acknowledge that they receive their mission from God through him, and that it is only through and in union with him that they are judges of the faith.

There have been times when there were eighteen hundred bishops, several of them holding far wealthier and more populous sees than the see of Rome: how was a single bishop able to bring all of them into submission—subjection, I should say—to himself? By the aid of the civil power? —Not at all. It is doubtful if any civil aid could have forced the bishops against the constitution of the church, which, on the supposition, they must have known as well as the bishop of Rome, and have had, each of them, equal authority to interpret,—against their own convictions and natural love of both power and independence, to acknowledge and submit to the papal supremacy. The acknowledgment and submission were yielded, as we have seen, before the bishop of Rome had, or could count on, any civil aid; and after the civil power became Christian, it as a rule sus-

tained, not the pope, but the refractory bishops in their resistance to his authority, and not seldom persecuted them if they obeyed it. Even the *False Decretals* were compiled in the interests of the episcopacy, not of the papacy. The theory, therefore, of papal usurpation is untenable, is unhistorical, unphilosophical, impossible, and can explain none of the facts in the case. The only adequate explanation of the fact is in the conviction of the faithful, of the church herself, that our Lord did build his church on Peter, and that Peter lives, teaches, and governs in his successors in the see of Rome. Hence the fathers of Chalcedon, when the tome of Pope St. Leo was read, exclaimed: "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo."

But along-side of these facts there is another series of facts in some sense opposed to them:—Not all bishops, nor all the laity, especially sovereign princes, have at all times yielded due and prompt obedience to the apostolic authority of the Roman pontiff; and such as resist have invented theories to excuse or justify their disobedience. They have alleged that the primacy of Peter and his successors, in the see of Rome, was only a primacy of order, not of jurisdiction; that it was conferred by the church, by the emperor, or the consent of the people; that the supremacy claimed and exercised by the Roman pontiff, is incompatible with the independence and authority of temporal princes, with the rights and independence of nations; that the civil power has in each nation the supreme authority in ecclesiastical administration and the temporalities of the church, indeed has no superior in any order, &c. Yet it is to be remarked that none of this series of facts are, properly speaking, facts within the church, or even endorsed by her authority. They are historical facts, indeed, but facts lying outside of the church; facts, so to speak, of the sovereigns or secular authority, and of refractory and disobedient churchmen, courtier bishops and prelates, imperial legists, who prefer the temporal to the spiritual, and Cæsar to Peter. Theories invented to justify or excuse them, have never been accepted or approved by the church, but always resisted by her, as well as the deeds they seek to justify.

Now it is on this series of facts that is based the antipapal theory of the Gallicans, and of the so-called Old Catholics with Döllinger at their head, and Bismarck as their patron. When I first became a Catholic in 1844, the method generally adopted and approved among English-speaking Catho-

lics, of repelling the charge that the papal supremacy is incompatible with the rights and independence of states, and that the spread of the Catholic Church, in this country especially, would prove dangerous to our republican institutions, was to cite examples from history, especially from English history, of Catholics adhering to the temporal sovereign, and arming in his defence in defiance of the pope. Priests, and even bishops, were accustomed to declare from the pulpit, that if the pope should dare to interfere with our civil institutions, they should be the first to buckle on a knapsack, shoulder a musket, and march to resist him. That is, if any thing was meant, Catholics would in case of a conflict between the two powers, support the national authority against the supreme authority of their church. They have often done so, but never as good Catholics. Always, since the formation of Christendom, especially since the development and growth of the nations of modern Europe, have there been plenty of nominal Catholics with bishops and archbishops at their head, to support Cæsar against Peter, and the secular power against the spiritual. But this fact only proves that erring secularists and nationalists are capable of resisting the pope, as all sinners resist God. Yet it proves not that the pope has not, or has not always had, supreme spiritual authority in the government of men and nations, or that the Council of the Vatican has introduced any new law or new faith. The question always comes up: Was this theory of the sovereigns, and of their courtiers and lawyers, and of the prelates who supported the national authority against that of the Roman pontiff, ever accepted by the church as Catholic doctrine? Or was it always opposed by her as repugnant to the rights of God, or the spiritual order?

We all know that when it was set up by the Greeks, and made their excuse for their disobedience to the supreme pontiff, they were condemned and excommunicated as schismatics. The sessions of the Council of Constance that impugned the papal supremacy, and the acts of the *conciliabulum* of Basil, that placed the council above the pope, were never approved by the supreme pontiff, remained always without legal force, and were responded to by the Council of Florence in 1439, where both East and West were united in the decree, that the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, the true vicar of Christ, the teacher of all Christians, has *plenary authority* to feed,—that is, to

teach,—direct, and govern the universal church. When thirty-five French bishops, with Bossuet at their head, in 1682, at the command of the court drew up the notorious four articles, the pope instantly condemned them as null and void, and the king promised to revoke his edict commanding them to be subscribed and taught by all theological professors in his dominions. Certain it is that Gallicanism and Döllingerism were the doctrine of the courts, never the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Yet we do not recollect that our Lord ever commissioned temporal sovereigns, Cæsar or his courtiers, to teach the nations his word, or gave them power to judge in spiritual matters. It is not true that Catholics are free to hold, and can hold without heresy, any opinions not explicitly and formally condemned, as the Gallicans assumed.

The *Alt-Katholiken* simply oppose to what has always been the teaching and the practice of the church, the unauthoritative theories and pretences of the temporal sovereigns, and their laic and cleric courtiers and adherents, who could not brook the papal supremacy or the independence of the church, and sought to bring her in her spiritual government, if not in her dogmas, into subjection to the imperial, royal, or national authority,—the essential principle of gentilism, as the very name *gentile* itself implies. So far from being old Catholics, they are only old heretics. Their heresy is as old as the great gentile apostasy from the patriarchal religion, or the dispersion of mankind after the building of the tower of Babel. Old they are, indeed, but not old Catholics. They are not Catholics at all; they are gentiles, that is, nationals, and labor to make the church in each independent country a national church, holding from the nation, and subject to the national authority. Dr. Döllinger objects to the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, because, in his judgment, they encroach on the rights of sovereigns, which, of course, he must hold to be paramount to the rights of God, or else his objection has and can have no force or pertinency. But no national church, subject to the national authority in her doctrine, discipline, temporalities, the education of her clergy, or the election and dismissal of her pastors, is the Catholic Church or any part of it. Such a church is simply a gentile church, not a Christian church, nor the kingdom of God on earth. *National* stands opposed to *catholic*, as the *particular* to the *universal*. The so-called Old Catholics lose the church by absorb-

ing it in the state or nation, and therefore are, like Anglicans, justly termed gentiles; but, however many fragments of Catholic truth they may retain, or how many Catholic practices they may continue, they are in no sense Catholics, though undeniably anti-Catholics. The very assumption of the epithet "old" proves it.

Nationalism, in one form or another, has always been an unrelenting enemy of the church. The Jews opposed nationalism to our Lord, and said: "If this man be suffered to go on, the Romans will come and take away our name and nation." The Romans never admitted any but national religious or national gods in their Pantheon. Conquered, tributary, or protected nations might retain their national religion, and worship their national gods, but were not permitted to abandon them for any other. The barbarians who conquered the empire and seated themselves on its ruins, no sooner began to be consolidated into distinct nations, than they made war on Catholicity and sought to make the church national, subject to the national taste and authority. Protestantism was born of nationalism; England separated from the pope through national prejudice against foreigners, especially Italians and Spaniards, and because she wanted a snug little English religion of her own, holding exclusively from herself. Gallicanism was born of the pride of *la grande nation* under *le grand monarque*, that revolted at the bare thought of recognizing the centre of religious authority elsewhere than in Paris. Even in this country, where the church has hardly gained a foothold, we hear men arguing that none but native-born Americans should be bishops or simple priests, just as if it could matter where a bishop or a priest is born, or of what nationality he is, if he knows his duty and is a fit man for his place.

The only conservative power in the church—and I might say in society—is the papacy. Reject the papacy, the supremacy of Peter in his successors, make the church simply episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, and she inevitably becomes national, and splits up into a thousand and one conflicting sects. A church really catholic is inconceivable without the papacy, as always believed by the church and defined by the Council of the Vatican. Without the pope as the source and centre of authority, the church as the kingdom of God on earth has and can have no unity, and without unity it can have no catholicity. Catholicity cannot be produced by aggregation, any more than infinity can

be obtained by the addition of numbers. Only that which is essentially ONE can be catholic.

The papacy is therefore essential to the very conception of the church as catholic. It is as essential to the church organism as the central cell, or organite, as physiologists say, to every living organism, in which all in the organism takes its rise, and from which it proceeds, or by which it is produced. The organite, or central cell, in all organisms generates or produces the whole organism. It must therefore be living and energetic, and of course does not and cannot derive its life or energy from the organism, which cannot exist without it; it must derive both life and the *vis generatrix aliunde.* Hence the spontaneous generation, asserted by some scientists, or sciolists rather, is impossible and absurd.

The church is defined by the blessed apostle to be the body of Christ, and must therefore be an organism, like every living body, not a simple organization or association of individuals. The pope, as its central cell, organite, or germ, cannot, then, derive his life, his *vis generatrix*, from the church organism, for without him that can no more exist than can the generated without the generator, or the creature without the creator. The pope derives his papal life, or generative energy, through the Holy Ghost from Christ, the Word incarnate. He lives by the life of Christ, and by him teaches and governs the universal church; he is, as pope, vitally connected through the Holy Ghost with Christ himself and is his representative or vicar, through whom the life of Christ flows to all who are in communion with him, and brings them into living union with Christ the Son, who is one in the unity of the Holy Ghost with God the Father.

It is thus, it seems to us, that we must understand the position and office of the papacy, if we assert a Catholic Church at all. The opinion emitted by the learned Benedictine, Tosti, in the prologue to his *Storia del Concilio di Costanza*, that the papacy, if lost, may be recovered by the bishops, and, failing the bishops, by the Christian people, seems to us to be untenable, since, without the papacy, there are neither bishops nor Christian people to reconstruct it. The individual pope may die, but the papacy is immortal. Among the three claimants in the great schism of the West, in the fourteenth century, there was a legitimate pope to whom the succession of Peter belonged; and that undoubtedly was Gregory XII. The Council of Constance was no

council till he convoked it, and the cardinals had after his resignation, elected a new pope, Martin V., who continued it. There was great confusion, no doubt, in many minds, much increased by the universal desire to heal the schism without deciding which of the claimants was the true pope, or censuring any one of the three obediences. But as there are no susceptibilities to manage at present, we need not hesitate to treat the Avignon and Pisan popes as no popes at all, and the successors of Urban VI. as the legitimate Roman pontiffs. The whole difficulty grew out of the conflict of nationalities; and if the church had not been supernaturally sustained, she would have perished in the struggle. And after all, it was that very schism that planted in Christendom the seeds of the Protestant defection, and the hardly less dangerous heresy of Gallicanism, which erected resistance to the papacy into a system, and obscured the minds, enfeebled the faith, and abased the Catholic character of the principal Catholic nations of Europe, and which has brought about the deplorable state of modern nations, hardly more Christian, except in name, than were pagan Greece and Rome.

But to return to the papacy as essential to the unity and catholicity of the church, the visible origin and source of all church life and authority, doctrine and discipline. The doctrine we have set forth, and which we expressly maintained in January, 1856,* can be successfully controverted only by denying that our Lord has founded a visible catholic church, or a visible kingdom of God on earth. The generality of Protestants acknowledge a catholic church in words at least; but very few of them hold her *visible* unity and catholicity, and most of them take refuge in the assertion of the *invisible* catholic church. They in fact recognize no church organism at all, and the visible churches they do recognize are simply aggregations or associations of individuals more or less numerous. They recognize no church in communion with Christ, and deriving its life from him and imparting it to its members. In their view the church, as such, is severed from Christ and has no vital relation to him, except through its members. It derives its life from the individuals associated, who must obtain their Christian life, if they have any, and give evidence of living it, before they can be aggregated to the society. Hence

*See *The Constitution of the Church,* Vol. VIII., p. 527.

their churches serve no purpose, count for nothing in the economy of grace, or of Christian life and salvation; and, accordingly, we find Protestants gradually, as they recede further and further from the church of Rome, coming to the conclusion that union with the church is not essential, and that one can live the Christian life and be saved outside of all church organizations, as well as inside of any of them, a conclusion strictly logical from Protestant principles.

To deny the visibility of the Catholic Church is to deny that our Lord has founded any church, or set up his kingdom on earth for the spiritual instruction, discipline, and government of men and nations. Catholic theologians distinguish, indeed, between the body of the church and the soul of the church, and maintain that only those who belong to the soul of the church can be saved; but they do not maintain, so far as I am aware, that one can belong to the soul without belonging, *vel re*, *vel voto*, to the body of the church. The soul of the church is Christ himself, and Christ cannot be distinct from Christ. The invisible church is not a church that Christ founds or creates, but is Christ himself without a visible body, organs, or representative; that is, no church distinguishable from the incarnate Word himself. This can be accepted only by those sophists who make no distinction between the Creator and his works. Among Catholics the church means always the visible body of Christ, mystically, or, as we have said, vitally, united to him through the Holy Ghost in the sacraments and communion with his vicar, the spiritual father of all the faithful. The "Old Catholics" cannot fall back on the invisible church of Protestants without giving up all pretence of being Catholics at all, in any recognized sense of the term.

The "Old Catholics" know perfectly well that the Catholic Church has always been papal, and that to deny the papacy has always been held to be a heresy fatal to the unity and catholicity of the church; which it must be, since our Lord said: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam.* If the Lord founded his church on Peter,—that is, the papacy,—it follows necessarily that, if you take away the papacy, you take from the church her foundation, and consequently leave her to fall through. Do the "Old Catholics" deny that they reject the papacy, or the papal supremacy, and assert that they only reject the papal infallibility? Be it so; the pope is supreme, if at all, *jure di-*

vino, and he is supreme in teaching the universal church—if we may credit the Council of Florence, which the "Old Catholics" must accept—no less than in governing. Never has it been lawful in the church either to dispute a papal constitution, or to appeal from the decision of the pope to a general council. The bishop, even prior to the recent definition, who should refuse to accept a papal definition of faith and protest against it, would have been *ipso facto* excommunicated and deprived of his jurisdiction. The authority of the pope from God to teach, implies the correlative duty of the church to believe what the pope teaches. If God authorizes the pope to teach, he commands us to believe his teaching. If the pope then could err in teaching, it would follow that God could be the accomplice of a false teacher, and command us to believe error; which is inconvenient and not supposable, for God is truth, and it is impossible for him to lie, to authorize a lie, or an untruth. If the papacy is admitted at all, the supremacy and official infallibility of the pope, as defined by the fathers of the Vatican, must be admitted, to say the least, as a necessary logical consequence. I could not assert that it was strictly *de fide*, but I believed the pope officially infallible by divine assistance when teaching *ex cathedra*, or deciding a controversy respecting faith for the universal church, as undoubtingly before the publication of the recent definitions of the Holy Father, the sacred synod approving, as I believe it now; and Gallicanism has always seemed to me to be inchoate Manicheism, and as such this *Review* has uniformly opposed it.

I have listened, with what patience I could, to the facts and arguments adduced to prove that the pope has erred in matters of faith; but even the great Bossuet was obliged to confess that he could not prove that any pope had ever erred when speaking *ex cathedra* and defining a point of faith, or condemning an error opposed to it. The strongest case is that of Pope Honorius, in relation to the two wills and the two operations in our Lord. That the pope was negligent, and failed to do his duty by crushing out the insurgent error at once with the authority of St. Peter, nobody disputes; but that he did not fall into heresy or err in his own doctrine, the learned Bishop Hefele fully concedes. This erudite historian of the councils, who had no unwillingness to find that the pope had erred,—for he was an opponent, not an advocate, of papal infallibility,—winds up his long

discussion of the question of Pope Honorius, by asserting that the pope was orthodox: a conclusion I had come to years ago, from the pope's own letters to Sergius. Nobody pretends that the pope is impeccable; but a moral fault is not necessarily a doctrinal error, and it is only for a moral fault that Pope Leo II. confirms the censure of his predecessor.

The pretence, that the definitions of the Council of the Vatican infringe the rights of sovereigns and impair the obligations of existing concordats, is hardly worthy of serious consideration. They change nothing in the previously existing relations of church and state, or in the obligations of the concordats conceded by the church to the state. The pope acquires by them, in relation to the church or the state, no new power, and no power he has not in all ages and nations claimed and exercised, or which has not been conceded by every sovereign state that has negotiated with him a concordat. The very fact of negotiating with him a concordat, recognizes him as sovereign pontiff or supreme governor of the universal or Catholic Church; and this is all that the council has defined as to the papal supremacy. Whether the church holds the pope to be infallible or not in teaching the universal church, is no concern of the state as such; for the state, in consideration of certain concessions to it by the pope in the concordat, guaranties her full liberty of doctrine and worship, and the state can take no cognizance of what she teaches her own children. Infallible or not, a papal constitution of doctrine has always been binding by every concordat on the state in its relations with Catholics or the Catholic Church; and in all cases where Catholic rights or duties were involved, is and always has been the supreme law for the civil courts. A papal constitution could not be lawfully resisted before the definition, any more than it can be now. Dr. Döllinger knows this as well as we do, and he cannot have made his objection in good faith.

The papal infallibility assures nations, governments, and individuals, that the pope can declare nothing to be the word of God which is not his word, or to be the law of God which is not his law; and no one has or ever had the right to disbelieve the word of God, or to disobey the law of God, as declared by the pope. The definition, therefore, imposes upon men or nations no new obligation of faith or obedience, and the papal infallibility offers the very guaranty that all men

and nations want: that nothing but the infallible word of God shall be proposed to the faith of either, and that nothing shall be exacted of either in morals or practice not enjoined by the divine law infallibly applied. Nothing is or can be more absurd than to object to the papal infallibility, if the pope be, by the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, really infallible. Infallibility in teaching, defining, and applying faith and morals, is what all men need; what gives them perfect certainty and security. And Almighty God could confer no greater boon on the human race than in the institution of a living and visible organ of such infallibility, accessible to all the world. The infallible pope is in the spiritual firmament what the sun is to the material, and gives light, life, warmth, and health to all on whom he sheds his radiance. The great difficulty men have in believing it, is that it seems too good to be true. But is there any thing too good for Him to give us, who freely gave up his only begotten Son to die for us; or is there any good that the Son, who freely humbled himself, took on him the form of a servant, and for his love of us submitted to the death of the cross, and to whom is given by his Father all power in heaven and on earth, will withhold from us? Do we forget that the Gospel is the gospel of infinite goodness, love, and mercy?

Infallibility in teaching is a necessity, if men would know or believe the truth. Without infallibility somewhere and practically available in believing, there can be no true belief or faith human or divine; for a belief that is not certain is simply opinion, and without infallibility there is no certainty. Hence all men, who hold that certainty in any thing is attainable, assert infallibility. The rationalist asserts the infallibility of reason; the Protestant asserts the infallibility of the written word; Dr. Döllinger and his followers assert the infallibility of historical science, or the erudition of German university professors; Gallicans assert the infallibility of bishops either congregated in council or dispersed, each one teaching in his own diocese. Catholics assert the infallibility of reason in things which fall within its province, and the infallibility of the pope, by divine appointment and the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, in matters which transcend reason, or the natural order:—all equally assert infallibility. The rationalist asserts it only in the natural order, and excludes the supernatural order in which the natural has its root, and without which it does not and

cannot exist. The Protestant asserts the infallible Bible, but he has only a fallible authority, for he has no infallible authority for declaring its sense, in which only is it infallible. The Gallican, who denies the infallibility of the pope, is no better off; for he is obliged to admit that all the bishops in the world without the pope cannot make an infallible definition of faith, and that only those who are in communion with the pope and receive their mission from him, are to be recognized as bishops of the Catholic Church, or as having Catholic jurisdiction. So the Gallican has no infallibility without the pope. Without him there is no council, and the *ecclesia dispersa* is infallible only by virtue of communion with the pope, and it is only through him that we can know infallibly what bishops are in communion with him, or what the bishops, spread over the whole world, teach each in his own diocese.

The Döllinger rule, which assumes that the church is to be controlled in her definitions of faith by the investigations and conclusions of learned professors of German or any other universities, is at best only a reproduction of rationalism, and makes no account of the assistance of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth promised her, and without which infallibility is not attainable in the supernatural order. The definitions of the church, whether made by the pope in council or by the pope alone, are infallible, not by virtue of human learning, science, wisdom, or sagacity, but by the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost; and I do not find that Christ has anywhere promised this assistance to the learned professors of the German universities. Besides, of all the sciences, that of history is the least certain, as no man can doubt who has read the historical works even of Döllinger himself, especially his *Papsts Fabeln*. Historical science is so far from controlling the church in her decisions, that it is the church that must control the conclusions of the historian. The church is the controlling fact of the universe, and in her alone is to be found the key to all history and to all science. Hence no one who rejects the papacy, the central principles of the church, or proceeds to explain history or science from the outside of the church, or independently of her, can ever write true history or give us genuine science. He loses himself in a wilderness of facts, the sense or order of which baffles all his intelligence; for the universe is created and governed *ad Christum*, and therefore *ad ecclesiam*, which is his body, his glory, and in which are

concentrated and fulfilled all the purposes of the Creator. All history and all science must be studied from the point of view of the Word, as Frederic Schlegel, after St. Augustine, justly maintains; and therefore from the central point of the papacy, that represents him in the visible order.

The mistake of many of our German professors arises from their not considering that the natural exists in order to the supernatural, and that, taken without reference to its end in the supernatural, we have and can have no clue to its meaning or significance. Bishop Hefele, who has at length, we are happy to learn, accepted the decrees of the Vatican, professes in his history of the councils to relate the historical facts as he finds them, without reference to their bearing on Catholic dogma, and this method of writing history has met much and high commendation. It would be a true and just method were it not that the real fact is not intelligible, has no significance except in relation to dogma, and must be understood by the dogma, if understood at all. The truth of the dogma is the key to the true fact, and controls its sense, and therefore must control the judgment of the historian. History written with this superb indifference to dogma, that is, to the highest order of truth, is no history at all, unless by an inconsequence. The church is not an accident or an incident in God's universe; it is not a mere adjunct to the natural, and separable from it; but is integral in the Creator's works, as the end for which they all exist and to which they all tend. The church is their crowning fact, for which they are made and sustained. The church, then, is not a theorem, nor a hypothesis, which may be entertained, discarded, or ignored, as of no account. She is a universal fact, as much so as creation itself, and as the fact of creation, she accredits herself. She is not only the great central fact of the universe, but contains in her dogmas the principles and explication of all other facts. It is idle, then, to pretend that history can be written from a point of view outside of the church, or that it is indifferent to her dogma. All Catholics may not be capable of writing history, but none but a Catholic can write history worthy the name; nor can any one but a Catholic, who has in his church the key to all facts of every order, give us real science, or a scientific explanation of any class or order of facts. We say, then, dogma controls history, not history dogma, and dogma is determined by the church through the supernatural and infallible assistance of the

Holy Ghost, who leads her into all truth. These so-called Old Catholics (as if Catholicity could be either old or new) hardly deserve the serious refutation of their principle of infallibility, which we have given it. They are neither philosophers nor theologians; they have no breadth or depth of mind, and are as narrow and as superficial as our contemporary Protestants and rationalists.

We need not comment here on infallibility as asserted by Catholics. The Catholic assumes the validity, and indeed the infallibility of reason, in questions of pure reason, but the papal infallibility, by divine assistance, in all questions that transcend reason, so far as the truth in regard to them has been revealed by our Lord himself and the Holy Ghost through the prophets and apostles. Yet as the rational is for the super-rational and the natural is for the supernatural, in which it has its principle, medium and end, reason has not her complement in herself, and is completed only in revelation. The questions of either order do not come up separately from those of the other; they come up in a mixed form, run into each other, are, so to speak, interlaced one with another, so that both rules are brought into play at the same time, and are alike necessary in the solution of the problems raised. A broad and distinct line of demarcation between questions of reason and questions of supernatural authority can be drawn only for a short distance, and in general the two authorities do and must operate together, each performing its proper function. Philosophy is the rational element of theology, but philosophy and theology are not and cannot be two separate and independent sciences; each is necessary to the other, and the two elements together form only one complete and dialectic whole. Thus the Catholic never asserts reason at the expense of the papal infallibility, nor papal infallibility at the expense of reason; but accepts and harmonizes both in the dialectic constitution of the Creator's works, as revealed in the Word—works of nature and works of grace, both of which are equally his works, and forming ontologically one whole.

But Döllinger and his associates do not err solely through ignorance. At the bottom of their rejection of papal infallibility is a concession to cæsarism or nationalism, which is necessarily antagonistic to Catholicity, and to the papal authority which sustains it. They may call themselves Catholics to take away their reproach, to seduce the simple and unwary, or to obtain their salaries from the state; but

their real motive is hostility to the Catholic Church herself. A plan had been concocted prior to the Council of the Vatican, indeed an association was formed—if we may credit the statement made to us personally by an Anglo-Catholic, as he called himself, and of which he professed to be a member, and which he assured us had assumed formidable proportions—to effect a grand union of all episcopal churches, including the church of Rome, in the world. The plan, as detailed to us, contemplated a union, or, rather, a confederation of the Greek church, the Armenian church, the Russian church, the Anglican church, the Gallican church, the Spanish church, the Scandinavian churches, and the Roman church, on a national and liberal basis. Each national church was to be independent of the others in its internal arrangements and worship, was to have its own liturgy, and administer its own ecclesiastical affairs. The pope was to have the primacy of honor and order of the whole, but no jurisdiction except in his own national church. Anglicans, whose orders were considered doubtful, should submit to have their orders rehabilitated by bishops whose orders could not be questioned.

The obscurity in which the question of the papal prerogatives was supposed to be involved, it was thought, would afford an opportunity of bringing the great body of the Catholic people into the plan, and through their pressure and the influence of public opinion, force the pope to accede to the union or confederation. Our informant insinuated, rather than asserted, that Döllinger and his Munich friends were the originators of the plan; but he claimed to have recently visited him, and distinctly asserted that the learned professor belonged to the association, and was a prominent leader in the movement.

The convocation of the Council of the Vatican by the pope, was a terrible blow to the conspirators, and the two decrees, the one defining the papal supremacy, and the other the papal infallibility, was a severer blow still. They had left no stone unturned to prevent the adoption of these decrees, which so effectually dissipated the pretended obscurity which enveloped the prerogatives of the successor of Peter, and defeated all hopes of drawing the Roman church into their plan of national churches. This was fatal. Without the Roman church their confederation of national churches was sure to miscarry; for as long as Rome stood out, they could get nobody to acknowledge their confeder-

ation of national churches as the Catholic Church. The convocation of the council was in the nick of time, and nothing could have been more opportune than the definition of the papal supremacy and infallibility, so strenuously resisted even by a number of eminent prelates as inopportune. These eminent prelates, we must believe, little knew into whose hands they were playing, or what influences had been brought to bear on them; and the convoking of the council and its decrees are to us a new proof that the church operates under divine direction, and that our Lord watches over the interests, and protects by his love and power the honor of his immaculate spouse. He has again brought to naught the councils of the ungodly against her. Blessed be his name now and for ever.

The plan, of course, was favored by the secular powers, and Döllinger and his associates were only the tools of Cæsar. Cæsar is instinctively opposed to Catholicity, and it is only under the influence of extraordinary grace that he tolerates any but national churches. He wants the church or religion to discipline his subjects and enforce on them, in the name of God, submission to his authority; but wants not a church able to subject him to her discipline if he does not reign justly and oppresses his subjects. In this he is the dupe of Satan. One of the great causes of the frightful alienation in modern times of the people, who are naturally conservative and never given to innovation, from the state no less than from the church and religion, is the fact that Cæsar has used the church to preach submission to the people, but prohibited her from using her authority to rebuke his own tyranny and oppression. To the people religion has come to appear as the accomplice of the despot, and they regard it as their worst enemy, and have in large numbers come to hate it, and to loathe its very name, although the Catholic Church is their best and often only friend, and, where free, is their most efficient protector. For the prevalent hatred of religion among the people, kings and their courtiers, worldly prelates, and *liberal* Catholics are responsible, and kings are no longer secure on their thrones. It is the inevitable effect of *decatholicizing* and nationalizing the church.

MANNING'S LECTURES.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1873.]

We read the writings of no contemporary author who seems to us to understand so well the threatening evils of our times in their causes and consequences as the illustrious archbishop of Westminster, the not unworthy successor of the lamented Cardinal Wiseman. The more we read the works the late cardinal has left behind him, the more are we struck by the richness of his mind, and the extent and variety of his learning and knowledge, the sweetness and unction of his spirit, and the depth and earnestness of his soul. He was the man for his times in England, and it would be impossible to estimate the services he rendered the Catholic cause in that ultra-Protestant kingdom. But his successor, in many respects a different type of character, as intellectual perhaps, and apparently less genial and more austere, is, in our judgment, as a man and a prelate by no means his inferior, or less fitted to his country or his times. His writings are no less profound, broad, or eloquent, and seem to us even more simple, direct, and effective. He seems to say the right word, at the right time, and in the right place, precisely the word, he makes us feel, that we should like to say, and would say if we could.

Few prelates were more zealous or more influential in support of the papal infallibility, and in obtaining its definition in the holy Council of the Vatican. Few, if any, saw more clearly the necessity of that definition to recover, even in Catholic ranks, the proper respect for the papal authority, to give a death blow to the liberalizing and compromising tendency that was obscuring the faith in the minds of prominent laymen and even of some churchmen, and rendering their Catholicity weak and puny, only a step removed from Protestantism itself; and we, English-speaking Catholics, owe him a debt of gratitude for the stand he took and the influence he exerted. Gallicanism, coupled,

Lectures on the Four Great Evils of the Day; the Fourfold Sovereignty of God; and the Grounds of Faith. By the Most Reverend Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster. Baltimore: 1872.

as it had begun to be, with the pretence that a Catholic is free to deny any proposition that has not been formally defined to be of faith, was become little different from the less radical forms of Protestantism, and rendered the assertion of Catholicity in its strength and plenitude not a little hazardous. It had become a reproach with large numbers of nominal Catholics, but real heretics, to defend the papacy, or to be called an ultramontane; and there was a time in our own country when a Catholic could, with less danger to his Catholic standing, speak against the pope than against the emperor of the French. It was high time that the papal prerogatives should be defined more explicitly than they had hitherto been, since the unity and catholicity of the church are inconceivable without the supremacy and official infallibility of the successor of Peter. Catholicity depends on unity, and unity, St. Cyprian tells us, in the visible order, is founded in the chair of Peter.

Now, without any change in faith, but by an explicit definition of what it is and always has been, a great change has been operated in the tone and feeling of Catholics towards the papacy; and every Catholic now understands that to contemn the pope is to contemn the church, and to contemn the church is to contemn Christ, whose spouse she is. The members are now one with their head, and the church is united and can move as "one man" against the enemies of God and his Christ. The publication of the syllabus was a great fact, the Council of the Vatican and its decrees is a greater fact still,—one which closes for ever the door to heresy, and makes the issue henceforth under one aspect, between Peter and Cæsar, and under another aspect, between the church and infidelity, or between Christ and Satan. Satan, we think, has gone the length of his tether, and can obscure the issue by no new heresy or new clouds of smoke from the bottomless pit. Persecutions, perhaps even to blood, may come, and heaven be peopled with new armies of martyrs, but Catholics can no longer mistake their banner or the word of command. This is an immense gain, and notwithstanding the very nearly universal defection of the temporal powers, the church seems to us never to have been stronger, or in a more favorable position for the discharge of her mission of winning souls to Christ, than she is now.

The four great evils of the day, according to the illustrious archbishop, are: 1. The revolt of the intellect against

God: 2. The revolt of the will against God: 3. The revolt of society from God: and 4. The spirit of Antichrist. —These four evils result from the revolt against the fourfold sovereignty of God. The divine sovereignty extends over: 1. The intellect of man: 2. The will of man: 3. Society: 4. The course of the world.—God is also sovereign as the divine Head of the church; and the church is sovereign by derivation from her divine Head, or as the representative of the divine sovereignty on the earth. The spirit of Antichrist is the revolt of man in his intellect and will, and of society against the sovereignty of the Word incarnate as the divine Head of the church; and of the derived sovereignty of the church as his representative. The four great evils of the times are, then, the complete rejection by man and society of the original and derived sovereignty of God and his Christ in the world, and over and through the church. They are all included in the spirit of Antichrist, or the rejection, under every aspect and in every relation, of the sovereignty of the Word made flesh,—the one mediator between God and man, or the medium of the divine sovereignty in the government of men and nations, and the course of the world.

We are apt, even when we believe, love, and obey it, to take too narrow and superficial a view of Christianity, or to forget that, as all things were made by the Word as the medium of the creative act of the blessed and ineffable Trinity, and without him was made nothing that was made, so were all things made, are preserved and governed *ad Christum*, or the Word made flesh,—the only medium by which the creature is perfected, or attains to and possesses God as his last end. All things are done through the Son and for the Son, for even the Holy Ghost, the Consummator, the Sanctifier, proceeds from the Father as principle, through the Son as medium, as we are taught in the creed; for the Holy Ghost proceeds *a Patre Filioque*, not as from two principles, but as from one principle. Hence the denial either of the blessed and indivisible Trinity or of the Incarnation, is alike to deny the whole of Christianity, and to reject the whole divine order in the creation and government of the world,—the end for which all things exist, the medium by which they are created and sustained, and by which they can attain to God as their final cause or supreme good. It is not a light thing, then, to deny either the incarnation of the Word who is God, or the ineffable mystery

of the Trinity, for to deny either is in reality to deny creation and even God himself.

The Christian order is neither an afterthought nor an accident in the divine decree, but is the divine order itself, which, from the inception of creation to its consummation, is the glory of the Word made flesh. The church is integral, not a mere incident in this divine order. She is teleological, and the medium through which the Word made flesh operates, and the Holy Ghost perfects creation, or consummates all things. The church, then, is an essential element in the divine order, no less so than the Incarnation, of which it may be regarded as in some sense the visible expression and continuation. Revolt against the church carries with it, then, the revolt against Christ, the incarnate Word, against the blessed Trinity and therefore against the divine sovereignty, under all its aspects, over the intellect, the will, society, and the course of the world, and generates the four great evils of modern society.

But, as we have shown in a foregoing article, the papacy, as defined by the Council of the Vatican, is essential to the very existence and even conception of the church as one and catholic; the denial or rejection of the papacy, or the supreme authority in governing and teaching of the successor of Peter by divine institution, or the rejection of the pope as the true vicar of Christ, is the spirit of Antichrist, and carries with it the rejection of the church, the sovereignty of her divine Head, the whole divine order of creation, and the fourfold sovereignty of God;—as the illustrious archbishop makes evident in these masterly lectures to all who can read and understand them.

We can from this understand why the archbishop, and all those whom Dr. Newman inconsiderately denounced in his hasty note to Bishop Ullathorne as "a faction," were in such dead earnest to get the papal question decided by the Council of the Vatican. It is said that the Jesuits were the principal agents in obtaining the definition of the papal infallibility. This is perhaps an exaggeration, though they were among its most earnest and indefatigable advocates; but if true, it would be in the last degree to their credit, and constitute the crowning glory of their illustrious society. The two decrees of the council,—the one defining the papal supremacy, and the other, the papal infallibility,—opposed the truth directly to the fundamental error of the modern world, the mother error, of which all its other errors against faith

and the divine order are born. Never did a council, or, rather, the pope, the council approving, emit more important decrees, or publish definitions more needed, or that struck with anathema a greater or a more destructive error; and let us add, that no council ever convoked, or that ever deliberated on matters of faith, ever gave more conclusive evidence of having been guided and assisted by the Holy Ghost. Satan rallied all his forces against them, induced kings and princes to threaten the fathers assembled, instigated scholars to abuse their erudition and science, and made the timid predict fearful schisms, persecutions, and the ruin of the church, to prevent the adoption of the schema; yet they stood firm, and the Holy Ghost enabled them to rise above all considerations of mere human prudence, and to proclaim in the face of the hostile world the truth that condemns it, and gave them the strength and energy to combat it and save the church and society. The syllabus and the Council of the Vatican are the redeeming facts of the nineteenth century, and prove that "the Lord's ear is not heavy that he cannot hear, nor his hand shortened that he cannot save."

It is now easy to trace the rise and progress of the fourfold error, or the four great evils of the day, set forth clearly, truthfully, and eloquently, by the archbishop of Westminster. Men did not fall all at once to that lower deep in which we find them now sunk. They do not begin by denying out and out the divine sovereignty. They begin by indulging passions and tendencies which that sovereignty commands them to restrain, and which obscure or dim their intellectual perception of the truth. They then adopt some error or deny some truth, which they persuade themselves, or are persuaded by Satan, does not necessarily involve the denial in any degree or in any sense of the divine sovereignty, but which Satan knows must, in its logical development, carry with it the denial of the whole. All heresy logically developed is a denial of the fourfold sovereignty of God, and this shows the terrible evil, the guilt of heresy, as high treason against the divine Sovereign, and why the church always treats it as a more grievous sin than a mere act of disobedience; but men are not always logical, and do not always and at once push their errors and heresies to their last logical consequences. It is only gradually and with time that they are evolved.

There were many and grievous heresies prior to the six-

teenth century, as the Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, the monothelite, &c., in which some specific article, dogma, or proposition of faith, was denied; and though it logically involved the denial of the whole Christian or divine order, their adherents were for the most part content with the specific heresy or denial, and remained in all other respects orthodox; for none of them, though disobedient to it, formally and expressly, as their fundamental and essential denial, which generated all their other denials, ever denied the Catholic rule of faith. This was reserved for the heretics —reformers, as their followers call them—of the sixteenth century. Protestantism contained, no doubt, no small number of specific heresies which were condemned by the holy Council of Trent; but, properly speaking, it was itself a generic rather than a specific heresy. Its fundamental, essential, generic heresy was the denial of the papal supremacy and infallibility. The denial did not seem to them, any more than it does to Dr. Döllinger, to be a denial of the Catholic Church, far less to be a virtual denial of the Catholic faith, or the divine order in creation, and a universal revolt against the divine sovereignty. To their minds, obscured and enfeebled by their pride and other passions, the papacy seemed but an unessential element in the church, and without any significance in the divine plan of creation, redemption, and glorification. They did not understand that all things are created and ordered *ad Christum*, and therefore *ad ecclesiam*, and consequently *ad Petrum*, on whom the church is built, and who teaches, directs, and governs it through his successors in the see of Rome. They did not see that to reject the papacy was to reject the church, and to reject the church was to reject Christ, the Word made flesh; or that to reject the Word made flesh is to reject the entire Trinity, God himself, or that there is no logical standing-point between the papacy and atheism. They regarded this as foolishness, and took the pope to be, not the vicar of Christ representing his authority in the visible church or the kingdom of God on earth, but as Antichrist, the "man of sin," who "put himself in the place of God, and exalted himself above all that is worshipped as God."

That the essential principle of the Protestant movement was a revolt from the papacy, not merely disobedience to the sovereign pontiff—as was the case in the Greek schism —but an express and formal rejection of the papal constitu-

tion of the church, and the absolute denial of all papal authority, is evident from the fact, that it is the only principle in which all Protestants were agreed in the beginning, and have continued to be agreed down to the present. There are not wanting in all Protestant sects individuals who will say, as I said while still associated with Unitarians: "The problem for our age is Catholicism without the papacy;" but none of them will accept the pope as the vicar of Christ on earth, for the moment a man becomes convinced of the divine institution of the papacy, he feels that he is no longer a Protestant, and that he is bound in conscience to seek admission into the church in communion with the holy Roman See. Many Protestants are led to abjure their Protestantism and to seek admission into the Catholic Church by various other good and satisfactory reasons, and to accept the papacy without any very clear or distinct perception of its importance or its profound significance in the divine order; but no one who is convinced that the pope is the vicar of Christ can honestly remain in a Protestant communion, or outside of the communion of the Catholic Church.

We are far from pretending that the reformers or their adherents comprehended that the rejection of the papacy logically involved the rejection of the church of Christ, the sovereignty of God, the whole divine order, and even God himself. The reverse was the fact. They saw no logical connection, indeed no connection of any sort, between these several propositions; it took the true logical instinct of the atheist Proudhon, to perceive and to tell his readers that, if they admitted the existence of God, they must, to be consistent, admit the Catholic Church, the pope, the holy water-pot, and all. They thought they could reject the pope and retain, even with advantage, the church, the Christian faith, Christ, the Trinity, the fourfold sovereignty of God, as the so-called Old Catholics, with far less excuse, do now; and it is possible that if they had not so thought, they would have perceived the satanic character of the movement they were following, and recoiled from it with horror. Satan would be a sad bungler, if, when he wishes to seduce men from their allegiance, he could not mask his design under the affectation of intenser and more single-hearted loyalty; if he could not, after showing the flowery and enticing entrance of the path in which he wishes them to walk, conceal from them the abyss to which it inevitably leads.

In point of fact, the reformers did not profess, in rejecting the authority of the pope and, therefore, of the church and councils, to reject all authority in matters of faith; but to fall back on the authority and infallibility of the written word, which the popes and councils, the whole church, had always recognized and maintained. It was an artful dodge, to use an expressive slang phrase. The pope could not deny either the authority or the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures; and if they could be made to appear in court against him, he could not have a word to say in his own defence; judgment must go against his claims, and the people be emancipated from his usurped authority, and reject him with scorn and contempt. But the Bible is authoritative and infallible only in the sense of the Holy Ghost who inspired it, and for determining that sense they had, after rejecting the pope as Antichrist, no infallible and, therefore, no authority at all. They could not agree among themselves, and have never been able to agree among themselves, as to the mind of the Holy Ghost, or the sense in which the Scriptures must be understood in order to be the infallible and authoritative word of God. They were obliged to fall back on the Scriptures interpreted by private judgment, then on private judgment without the Scriptures, and therefore lost the sovereignty of the Word made flesh, and every thing of Christ but the name, to which they had no right, and which they only dishonor.

Thus by rejecting, as the spirit of Antichrist induced them to do, the derived sovereignty of the pope as head of the church, they lost the authority of the word of God written or unwritten, the sovereignty of Christ given him by his Father and conquered by his obedience, his cross and passion, and his victory over death and the grave, and, finally, the sovereignty of God over the intellect and will, over society, and the course of the world. Step by step, the world that revolted against the papacy in the sixteenth century, has traversed every degree of error down to the lowest depths of atheism. The invincible logic, of which the human mind can never even in error wholly divest itself, has driven them thus far. Atheism was logically contained in their first denial, and time and events have only developed it, brought it out, and actualized it. We have the proof of this in the present state of the non-Catholic world.

Protestantism being not a specific heresy, but the generic principle of all heresy, the archbishop in some of his writ-

ings has said truly, that "there can be no new heresy, or that the era of heresies is closed," except, we add, with the inert mass of Protestants whom the age leaves behind, who still imagine they are in the middle of the sixteenth century, and who count for nothing in the present and future movements of the world governed by the spirit of Antichrist. The controversy is now, not between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, but is between God and no God, the universal divine sovereignty, and the universal, intellectual, moral, social, and religious anarchy of Antichrist. Whoever is able to discern the signs of the time sees and understands this; and we have found no one,—after our Holy Father, Pius IX., now gloriously reigning, although a prisoner in the Vatican,—who understands it better than the illustrious archbishop of Westminster, the real primate of England, we might say of the English-speaking world. He has a weakness for his former Anglican brethren, and a belief in the good faith and true piety of many of them, that we do not share. We doubt not that there are many souls in the Anglican establishment that will be saved, not in it indeed, but by being gathered out of it, like the archbishop himself, into the one fold, under the one shepherd. But aside from this, the archbishop seems to be led and assisted by the Holy Ghost to a right and full understanding of our age, its evils, its terrible errors, and its spiritual needs. The age in regard to what characterizes it has fallen back two thousand years, and sits in the region and shadow of death, mocked by the delusive hopes of the "prince of this world."

It is a little remarkable that the holy Council of Trent, though it condemned the specific heresies of the so-called reformers, only indirectly condemned what we have called their generic principle, or the generic principle of all heresies,—so to speak, heresy itself. Humanly judging, the clear and distinct assertion of the papal supremacy and infallibility, as has since been done by the holy synod of the Vatican, by the Tridentine fathers, would have saved Catholics and Catholic nations from the terrible scourge of Gallicanism, and prevented the downfall of Christendom; but we suppose they were restrained from directly and distinctly raising and settling the question by prudential considerations, such as we heard urged with so much earnestness and force by the inopportunists in the late Council of the Vatican. The sovereigns had always regarded with

a jealous eye the power of the pope, and even the Catholic sovereigns in the sixteenth century would have refused to support the church in her struggles with armed heresy, if the council had taken any action that tended directly to exalt or confirm the papal power. The fathers may have thought it imprudent in the fearful crisis which then existed, to alienate such powerful princes as the emperor of Germany, the king of France, and the king of Spain, and to throw them into the arms of the reformers. In a question of prudence, neither the pope nor the council is held to be infallible; but it would be rash for a simple individual to say that they actually erred in their judgment. The affairs of church and state were so complicated or mixed up with each other at the time, that it is probable it would have been an act of decided imprudence for the fathers of Trent to have done what has been so nobly, bravely, and even prudently, done by the fathers of the Vatican. The church knows that there is a time for every thing, and that nothing is well done, unless done in its proper time. She is forced at times to choose between two evils, and we must always presume that when she does so, she chooses the least.

Another consideration may have had weight with the fathers of Trent. At the time when the council held its sessions, the generic principle of Protestantism had not been fully explicated, and neither Protestants nor the great body of the faithful could see all or the chief consequences it logically involved, and which time and events would develop; and the reason or necessity, nay, the full meaning of the condemnation would not have been understood by the majority of either party. In order to render the condemnation intelligible and effective, the fathers may have judged, and rightly judged, it necessary to wait developments, not, as the developmentists inconsiderately maintain, of Catholic doctrine—for that was as well known and as perfectly understood by the church in the first century as in the nineteenth—but of error, the denial of the papacy, or till it had become evident to all the world, that the denial of the sovereignty of the visible head of the church derived from the divine Head, carries with it the denial of the sovereignty of Christ, and, therefore, the entire sovereignty of God. This, which was evident in the sixteenth century to only a few, had become manifest to all the world, and absolutely undeniable in the nineteenth. It is easy,

then, to see a good and valid reason, why the church,—though always indicating her own mind on the question,—never fully and explicitly expressed it, till events and the inherent developments of the denial had drawn practically and openly its last logical consequences.

It was not to be expected that the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, defining the papal supremacy and infallibility, would excite no opposition, or at once bring back to the communion of the church the nations that had declared that they would not have God to reign over them, or submit to him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. The debates in the council developed a serious opposition, at least to the opportuneness of the definition, among the bishops themselves; and though every one, as far as we know, without a single exception, has accepted it, yet we may reasonably suppose that those who had been trained in the Gallican habits of thought, and accustomed to defend the church after the Gallican fashion, would require time to adjust their minds to the new definition, and to comprehend its full reach and bearing on Catholic theology. Merely nominal, lukewarm, timid, and, especially, liberal Catholics so-called—whose Catholicity had heretofore consisted in their liberal concessions of what is not their own to the enemies of the church, and in their persistent efforts to circumscribe the papal power within the narrowest sphere possible without expressly denying it—would of course be dissatisfied with it, and it was to be expected that numbers of them would go out from us, because they are not and never were of us. Those outside would certainly not at first be attracted by it, were sure rather to be repelled by it, and to find in it an additional motive of hostility to the truth. Yet we look upon it as the beginning of an upward tendency in the public mind, and of a real revival of Catholicity in the heart of the nations.

The first effect, greatly aided by the opposition, must be on the Catholic body, and tend to bind Catholics, especially the bishops and clergy, more closely to the visible head of the church, and to render them more independent of the civil power, freer in their spiritual action, and more earnest and devoted in their zeal for the prosperity of the church and the salvation of souls. One of the greatest evils the church in all past ages has had to contend with, was, that her pastors, especially in the higher ranks, felt that they depended, not on their spiritual chief alone, but in part, and

often even, on their temporal or national sovereign, always ready to support them against the papacy. Indeed this evil has continued down to our own times, until there has ceased to be a national sovereign that acknowledges his allegiance as temporal sovereign to the Holy See; and this is one great reason why we have found Catholics so feeble in old Catholic nations, in need of persecution more or less severe to invigorate their faith, to inflame their charity, and to render them by the grace of God robust and heroic. Pope Gregory X., in the second Council of Lyons, told the assembled bishops that, if there were evils to be redressed, they themselves were alone the cause. They were so, because they were more devoted to their temporalities which they held from the prince, than to the pope from whom they held their spiritual functions, and therefore more solicitous of the favor of their temporal sovereign than of their spiritual chief. The abandonment of their professed protection of the Holy See by the European sovereigns, is not, therefore, an unmixed evil. The bishops and clergy have now little or nothing to expect from them; and the most they can hope from them, after being despoiled of their temporalities due to the faith and charity of former times, is to be let alone, and in poverty, obscurity, and unrecognized by the civil power, to labor to reconstruct Christendom, and in union with their chief to bring back the apostate nations to their allegiance to the Sovereign of sovereigns.

The strength and efficiency of the entire hierarchy is in the papacy, in the strict union of its members with, and entire dependence on the supreme pontiff. This secures them entire freedom and independence, in face of the powers of earth, as all true freedom and independence of every sort, and of all ranks and orders, are in entire dependence on God, and subjection to him alone. Only they are free whom the Son makes free. The freedom, energy, and robustness of the faithful are in their intimate union through their pastors with their chief, the vicar of Christ. This union will be rendered practically more complete by the decrees of the Vatican, which make the pope, as the vicar of Christ, the centre and fountain of all life and authority in the church of God. They make the church the free, independent kingdom of God on earth, and make the members of the hierarchy feel that they are princes, and the faithful people understand that they are free citizens, of a kingdom which is above and over all the kingdoms of the earth, and of whose

glory and dominion there shall be no end. The decrees of the Vatican concerning the papacy tend directly to unite in one body with one soul the whole Christian people, cleric and laic, and to render it strong and invincible against every enemy of God and his Christ, and to prepare it for the conquest, and, where need is, for the reconquest of the world, and its subjection to the divine sovereignty.

The hope of the world is in Christ, the one mediator of God and men; and Christ operates only through and for his church, which he loves, and has purchased with his own precious blood. It is only then through his church,—the congregation of the faithful united together and to him in one faith, under one regimen, and the participation of the same sacraments,—that the world can be practically redeemed, or receive the practical application of the atoning sacrifice of our Lord, and be carried forward to the realization of their beatitude in eternal union with God and a participation of the divine nature, or become, as St. Peter says, *naturæ consortes divinæ*. In rendering the body of the faithful more thoroughly united and compact, these decrees, though for the moment they may apparently lessen the numbers aggregated to the body of the faithful, must, as time goes on, strengthen the church, render her more independent of the world, and more efficient in the discharge of her divine mission to teach and govern in spirituals all men and nations.

It is precisely in the effect these decrees, coupled with the publication of the syllabus, will have on the faithful themselves,—not in any direct effect they may have on those outside of the Catholic body,—that we see the beginning of the Catholic revival, or *renaissance*, as say the French. We in no sense justify or excuse those who remain aliens from the church, or those who apostatize from her communion, and become her bitterest and most relentless enemies. Nothing can excuse their voluntary blindness, or mitigate their terrible guilt; but it would be a great mistake to suppose that Catholics have no responsibility. Had Catholics been all and always true, earnest, and devoted Catholics, and been less wedded to the world which they renounce in baptism, and more thoroughly animated by the spirit of Christ, and devoted to his vicar, whom they have but too often left to bear alone the brunt of the battle with the enemies of the church, there would be now few heathens and no heretics in the world to convert. Then, just in proportion as the Catholic body become united and act as "one man," in the fine

scriptural phrase, filled with the burning charity of the Gospel, and elevated to the height of the Catholic mission, the more effective it becomes in the conversion of men and nations to our dear Lord, and in subduing and scattering his enemies. We catholicize heretics and infidels by becoming thoroughly catholicized ourselves. Hence this *Review* has always maintained, that the only way to convert the American people is to labor with all charity, zeal, and energy, to make the Catholic population already in the country intelligent, earnest, self-denying, practical Catholics, adorning their faith by their union and good works. As Christ converts the world through the church, so is our country to be converted through the Catholic population it contains. The more this population becomes one compact body, the more truly Catholic it becomes, the greater will be its efficiency in converting the country, though few direct efforts for its conversion should be made. In this, we apprehend, we only express the conviction and the policy of our own enlightened and devoted hierarchy.

The reader will perceive that we have made no attempt to review these masterly lectures, nor to give even an abstract of their contents. We could not condense them, and to review them would be on our part an impertinence; and, besides, all our readers, we presume, have already read and admired them, and profited by their rich thought, profound wisdom, and sound Catholic doctrine. All we have aimed at is to express our high appreciation of them and their author, and to throw out some thoughts of our own on the subject with which he has inseparably connected his name. It is not for us to judge, certainly not to speak disparagingly of those prelates who in the council opposed the definition of the papal infallibility for what they regarded as prudential reasons; they were, as the judgment of the church has decided, on the wrong side, but we have no right to say they erred in faith, or in any respect to impugn their motives. They none of them, if we are rightly informed, opposed the definition on the ground that they do not or did not believe the doctrine. Overruled on the question of opportuneness or expediency, there could be no inconsistency and no humiliation in their accepting, *ex animo*, the definition when made. Their opposition, freely and fully expressed, proves that the council was a free council, deliberated, and decided freely, and thus disposes of the objection so unjustly raised against it by Döllinger and the wretched men who call themselves "Old Catholics."

For ourselves: We, when the question was raised, should have been glad to have found these eminent prelates, whom we honor as princes of the church, on the other side, but perhaps it is better that they were not, for their opposition gave ample room for an able and full discussion of the question by the greatest intellects, the profoundest scholars, and most eminent theologians of the world; and their prompt and hearty adhesion to the definition is not only highly edifying, but proves that it was in no uncatholic spirit that they opposed the definition. They were, as we have said, on the wrong side, but were right at heart and, as Catholics, above all reproach and all suspicion. We give this explanation in justice to them, after the commendation we have bestowed on the archbishop of Westminster.

BISMARCK AND THE CHURCH.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for April, 1873.]

We find in the *New York Times*, of Feb. 7, 1873, the following abstract of a lecture by the Protestant "Episcopal" bishop of Long Island in this state; which shows sufficiently what Anglicans hope and expect from the "Old Catholic party" and the war waged by power against the church in Germany, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy:—

"Right Rev. A. N. Littlejohn, D.D., delivered a lecture last evening at St. Paul's Chapel, corner of Clinton and Carrol streets, Brooklyn, on 'The Old Catholic Movement in Europe.' This subject, which has recently attracted considerable attention, and enlisted the sympathies of the various Christian congregations not in communion with Rome, drew a large audience, and Dr. Littlejohn, who spent a part of last summer in Germany, was in intimate relations with some of the leaders of the party. Their object, he said, was to reform abuses, and to introduce a purer and more broad Christianity, than was professed by the party of the Vatican. The congress recently convoked in Cologne, was composed of men who now rule the party of reform. That party, numerically, is not large, but its strength consists in the quality of its leading men; and with the lower classes of Germany, the stronghold of the movement, it is not very popular; but then it is an appeal to the intellect, and not to the untutored masses. In Germany and

Austria, seventy priests and one hundred congregations had joined the reformers. It is also, he said, extending in Bavaria and Switzerland, and seven newspapers are acting as its organs. Late advices from the latter country, received by private parties a few days since, tell of a council which assembled on the 1st of December at Ultan, where one hundred delegates represented various districts. The programme of church reform was debated: and, owing to the eloquence of Dr. Reinkens, of Breslau, the departure of the papal nuncio from Berne was demanded. The dream of the Germans is to form an independent national church, and in Austria, Spain, and Italy the same idea is spreading. A synod is to be organized, and bishops properly chosen, and a union of all sects of Christians established. The profession of faith embraces all the dogmas of the Old Catholic creed, as adopted by the Council of Nice, and the Bible is accepted as the rule of faith. Enforced celibacy and auricular confession are to be abolished, and service in the native tongue introduced. After reviewing the recent political changes in Europe, and pointing out their bearings on the present movement, Dr. Littlejohn concluded by stating his belief in the success of the new reformation and the overthrow of the papacy."

Dr. Littlejohn is good authority, so far as relates to the purposes, plans, and designs of the "Old Catholic party" and the European governments, now waging war against the papacy, denying the freedom and independence of the church, and cruelly oppressing her religious orders and her devoted children. He fully confirms the statement of the Holy Father in his allocution of the 23d of December last, and which rendered the Prussian press so frantic, that the object of these governments is "the total destruction of the Catholic Church." This is unquestionably the aim of Prince von Bismarck, chancellor of the new German empire, of the council of Geneva, if not of the Swiss federal council itself, and of the ministers of Victor Emmanuel, as it is the design of the entire revolutionary, or liberal, party throughout the world. Dr. Littlejohn himself says as much, when he tells us that "the dream of the Germans is to form an independent national church," and that in Austria, Spain, and Italy, the same idea is spreading, and expresses his belief that "the new reformation," favored by recent political changes in Europe, will be successful in the "overthrow of the papacy." The Catholic Church is built on Peter, and the overthrow of the papacy would be the subversion of the very foundation of the whole edifice; and the conversion of the one Catholic Church into independent national churches, or, rather, into churches holding from the national

authority and dependent on its will, would be her total destruction. For, as we have heretofore shown, *national* stands opposed to *catholic*, and independent national churches necessarily exclude the very idea of one catholic church with authority to teach and govern in spirituals all men and nations, and holding from God alone; as completely as the assertion, on the other hand, of universal monarchy would be the destruction of particular independent national governments, though our Protestant "Episcopal" bishop of Long Island does not appear to be aware of it; for, though claiming to be a churchman, his ideas of Catholicity and the church are a little muddy.

The establishment of independent national churches, that is, ecclesiastically independent, and politically dependent, implies the annihilation of the Catholic Church. Rightly, then, is the aim of the movement said by the Holy Father to be the total destruction of the church, or the visible kingdom of God on earth. It is well that Catholics should understand this, that they may not be deceived in any respect as to the real nature of the controversy now raging, or the momentous consequences involved in the issue. It is well that they should see clearly that in this controversy there can be no compromise, no halting between two opinions, no neutrality. The question is one of life or death, and the issue is the church or the world, Christ the Light of the universe or the prince of darkness, God or the devil, heaven or hell. This is the momentous issue between the Holy Father and his enemies. The issue is squarely made, and must be squarely met. Who is on the Lord's side must be on the side of the pope, the vicar of Christ; and whoever takes sides against the pope, or does not take sides for him, takes sides with the prince of darkness, and serves Baal, not the Lord, the devil, not God, and exposes himself to the doom pronounced against the devil and his angels. There can, we repeat, be no neutrals. Whoever in this fearful struggle is not on the side of the pope and the church of which he is the visible head, is on the side of Satan, and aiding and abetting those who are fighting to exclude Christ the Lord from all authority in human affairs, and to liberate all men and nations from every obligation to consult any power or authority above themselves. Catholics should feel that there is no evading the issue; and we are sure none, except a handful of liberal Catholics, every day losing their prestige, and diminishing in numbers, have any desire to

evade it. It is wonderful how the faith and courage of Catholics have revived and been strengthened since the Holy Father has been despoiled of his temporal possessions and imprisoned in the palace of the Vatican. Catholic honor comes to invigorate Catholic faith and courage: for what man, with a man's heart in his bosom, will desert his flag in the heat of battle and go over to the enemy?

The theological leader and instigator of the war against the papacy or the Catholic Church, is Dr. Döllinger of Munich, once held in high esteem by Catholics in Germany and England, though, we must say, distrusted by us years ago. His pride seemed to us to surpass his learning, and his learning to surpass his judgment. It was he and a small number of his friends that got up the conspiracy against the Council of the Vatican before it assembled, and in order to prevent it from defining the infallibility of the pope, and endorsing the syllabus, in which some propositions of his own were censured. He induced Prince Hohenlohe, then prime minister of Bavaria, to address a circular, probably written by himself, to the diplomatic agents of the Bavarian government at the several European courts, setting forth the danger to the secular powers and to modern civilization to be apprehended from the probable action of the council, and suggesting the propriety of the several powers uniting in a protest against any endorsement of the syllabus, or declaration of papal infallibility. Either, it contended, would have a grave political bearing, and the latter would clothe the pope with political supremacy over all the secular powers of the earth.

The circular, which the archbishop of Westminster has recently published in an important introduction to a volume of "Sermons on Ecclesiastical subjects," plausibly and skilfully drawn up, was not without effect, and had led several European governments, the French and Austrian, especially, and that of Sardinia as a matter of course, to threaten the council, in case it did such things, that they would resist it. It also made many eminent prelates, in view of the threatened hostility of the secular powers it had stirred up, doubt the prudence of pressing the question of infallibility to a decision, and indeed oppose it, as everybody knows, as inopportune.

The theological leader had treacherously and by plausible, but wholly false, statements called to his aid the secular powers always more or less jealous of the papal authority; but

his conspiracy failed. No pressure brought to bear on the council, no threats or intimidation, singularly enough resorted to under pretence of maintaining its freedom against the tyranny exercised over it by the pope and Jesuits, could move it, or hinder the Holy Ghost from making his voice heard in its decisions. The papal infallibility was proclaimed by the Holy Father, the council approving; the syllabus, by implication, as the act of the infallible pope, was endorsed; Dr. Döllinger's propositions remained condemned; and German professordom was not recognized as infallible, or permitted to claim immunity from error. This was too humiliating. It was a triumph of Rome over München, of the Roman curia over German professordom. Could German professordom be expected to submit?

The theological leader had failed, and, as a theological movement, the conspiracy came to naught, but it had gained a political significance; and Prince von Bismarck,—who, through an alliance with antipapal Italy, had crushed Austria at Sadowa, and, by the aid of Catholic Germany, had conquered France and reduced her, for the present at least, to impotence, and had turned every thing topsy-turvy in Spain, with the secret connivance of Great Britain and Russia, both for the present prussianized,—came forward as the political leader of the movement, and pitted, not for the first time in history, the empire against the church, Cæsar against Peter. Döllinger had told him, in Prince Hohenlohe's circular, that the definition of the council was political rather than theological, encroached upon the rights and prerogatives of sovereigns, and, though there was not a shadow of truth in it, he could use it as a pretext for the war which, as a Protestant, he felt authorized to commence against the Catholic Church in favor of the modern doctrine that rejects all law, all authority, above the empire, and suffers to exist in the empire only national churches, or churches holding from and subject to the national authority. To carry out this doctrine, became his fixed purpose.

To effect this purpose, it is necessary to overthrow the papacy; for as long as the papacy stands the Catholic Church stands, as St. Ambrose says: *Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia.* The chancellor of the new German empire and champion of the kingdom of darkness, in laboring to this end, proceeded with considerable skill and ability. He first makes sure of Italy, and takes all possible precautions against any conscientious scruples, that might be awakened in the mind of

Victor Emmanuel and induce him to relax his hold on the patrimony of St. Peter, liberate the pope, make his peace with the church, and restore Rome to its rightful sovereign. This must not be on any account whatever; and should France or any other power even offer to interfere in behalf of the rights of the pope, it must reckon for its audacity with Germany. Should the Italians, the great majority of whom are still Catholics, attempt any measures likely to restore the Holy Father to his rights, Italy must at once be made a German, or rather, a Prussian province. Secured on this side, the next step was to relax the hold of the papacy on the convictions, affections, and consciences, of the Catholic people.

Here the Döllingerites, or Alt-Katholiken, could serve him; and therefore, against all law, all rights, and common sense, the chancellor insisted on treating them as Catholics, and defending for them all the rights secured to Catholics by the concordat. Recognized by the empire, and the Catholic prelates forbidden to subject them to the discipline enjoined by the canon law, it was thought that they would be efficient agents in undermining the papacy in the faith and love of the Catholic people. They were to set up the liberty of conscience against the authority claimed by the pope over it. Professor Reinkens, as represented by the *Churchman*, a Protestant Episcopalian sheet published in Hartford, Conn., and in this city, puts the case with tolerable cleverness, though we suspect the *Churchman* has added a few of its own blunders to those of the German professor.

After giving the Catholic side of the question, as presented in our article on "Döllinger and the Papacy," the *Churchman* proceeds to give the "other side," condensed from Professor Reinkens:—

"Professor Reinkens begins by affirming that the Old Catholic movement is a war of conscience against compulsion in matters of religion. Before July 18, 1870, it was still possible for the individual Catholic to save his conscience. This is, indeed, denied by Protestants, who refer to the fact that the pope has exercised the function of infallible teacher since the Council of Trent. The infallibilists also say that always the individual conscience was subject to the general conscience of the episcopate.

"But up to 1870 the real position was this, that the pope had, through persistent usurpations, become the judicatory from which was no appeal, and the individual conscience was thus silenced. The papal decisions

were accepted, not as necessarily right, but because there was no power to resist them. But the authority did not affect the conscience. Every one was at liberty, while he submitted to a papal decree, to deny the truth and justice of it before God and men. He might be compelled to obey it, as one obeys the decision of a civil court, but he was not compelled to believe that it was true and just. Thus the individual believer could still save his conscience.

"The Vatican council has changed all this. It has transferred to the Roman Church the fundamental idea of the 'Society of Jesus,'—that it is necessary to sacrifice to authority not only the will, but the understanding also. As in that society no one must think or judge otherwise than as the superior directs, so is it in the church with regard to the pope. There must be more than an external submission to his decrees. Whatever a man's individual knowledge and conscience teach him, he must judge and be convinced that these decrees are just and true,—that they are the Word and Law of God.

"Thus the voice of conscience ceases to be the voice of God: the pope is higher than conscience. What he says must be believed; what he commands or forbids, binds the conscience. The individual reason and freedom must be sacrificed. There is no room even for reasoning or reflection. God dwells in the pope, and he thinks for us. Whatever he declares in faith or morals is to be received as divine truth.

"It is against this teaching of Jesuitism being made the law of the church, that the Old Catholics rebel. They affirm that all authority, which we are to receive as divine, must rest upon the conscience. It must be in harmony with the internal voice of God. Any thing else leads to the worst hypocrisy. We are now tending to a fearful moral abyss. Jesuitical morality has fearfully spread. There are many abuses that need rectification, and the Vatican council had a noble work before it, but its action may be summed up in a sentence: It infallibly declared that a council is not infallible. And the infallible utterances of a fallible council we are expected to believe."

The *Churchman* is mistaken in saying, "The Infallibilists hold that the individual conscience was always subject to the general conscience of the episcopate." They hold no such thing, nor do they pretend in any sense whatever that the conscience of the Catholic is subject to the *conscience* of the pope. The conscience of the pope is his own affair, which he, equally with the simplest believer, must regulate with his confessor, and answer for to God, the supreme lawgiver. Catholics distinguish between the legislature that ordains the law, and the judiciary that declares and applies it. The pope binds the conscience, not as lawgiver, but as judge under the law which God has ordained.

It would be difficult to compress a greater amount of

ignorance, sophistry, and nonsense, not to say malice, into the same space, than is done in the *Churchman's* summary of Professor Reinkens's discourse or tract. No one was ever free to question a papal constitution internally, while he offered no external opposition; for every Catholic was required to give his consent *ex animo*, as all know who are aware of the bull condemning the "respectful silence" of the Jansenists. There can be no war for conscience against the papacy, if the pope is infallible in declaring the law of God; for there can be no conscience without or against that law. Conscience is a man's own interior judgment of what the law of God prescribes, permits, or prohibits. Deny the law of God, and you deny the existence and even the possibility of conscience, for you leave no law to which it is or can be subject. Conscience is free when it is subjected only to the law of God; it is not free when it is subjected to any human authority, or when the individual has no infallible authority by which to form his interior judgment of what the law of God does or does not prescribe, permit, or forbid. The papal infallibility in teaching, then, so far from denying, abridging, or restricting the freedom of conscience, is its indispensable condition and support. Catholics, and Catholics alone, have true liberty of conscience; and the liberty of conscience Professor Reinkens demands is liberty *from* conscience, not liberty *of* conscience, is simply the suppression of conscience itself, and the emancipation of men and nations from all law, except such as they impose on themselves which is simply no law at all. But the liberty of conscience which the professor asserts, really means liberation from conscience, and freedom to power to govern as it pleases, without any regard to eternal and immutable justice; and to individuals, to live as they list. But it is a good war-cry; and if people can be made to believe that the papacy instead of sustaining suppresses it, they are prepared to help on the war against the pope and the church. The so-called "Old Catholics," then, though of no account theologically, are of some importance to Bismarck, and able to aid him in a very necessary part of his great work of destroying and making an end of the Catholic Church, and of suffering only national churches, subjected to the national authority, to exist.

But this is not enough. It is necessary not only to open the mouths of "Old Catholics," that is, nationalists falsely pretending to be Catholics, but to close the mouth of all

earnest and efficient defenders of the pope and the church among the people. Bismarck's third step was, therefore, to silence the Jesuits and kindred religious orders, that is, missionary and teaching orders and congregations, to suppress their houses, and to banish them from the empire. This *Review* has not ever been noted for its devotion or subserviency to the Society of Jesus, and at times it has been even hostile to them, probably very much for the reason that the Athenian wished to ostracize Aristides; that is, because he was "tired of hearing him called the Just." The injudicious praise of them by their friends, as if they were the only true Catholics in the church, was little fitted to exalt them in the estimation of a man of our taste and temperament. The society is not absolutely free from imperfection; but the *Review* was wrong, and opposed them for things for which it should have commended and defended them. The estimate in which the society should be held by the loyal Catholic is easily determined by the fact, that, whenever any one would strike a blow at the heart of the church, he begins, whether a private or public person, by attacking the Jesuits, feeling instinctively that he must get them out of his way before he can render his blow effective. When an attack is to be made on religion, they are the first to repel it. Their simplicity and deficient worldly wisdom leave them sometimes to be imposed upon by the cunning and designing, but their Catholic instincts may always be implicitly trusted. Bismarck knows it, and therefore makes them his first victims. For the same reason he attacks all missionary and teaching orders. He knows that, if they have the ears of the people—and have them they will wherever they go—and the charge of the schools, and the training of children and youth, it is idle to dream of detaching the people, to any great extent, from the church, or of her destruction. What can Döllinger and his seventy apostate and excommunicated priests, even if recognized and sustained as Catholics by the civil power, do against the science, virtue, devotion to the Holy See, of a half a dozen Jesuits, Redemptorists, Lazarists, or even Sisters of Charity? It was absolutely necessary, if Bismarck would overthrow the papacy and destroy the church, to begin by making away with the Jesuits and other living religious orders and congregations. An obedient and servile *Reichsrath* carries out his wish in the empire, and a submissive Italian parliament meekly receives and executes his orders to the same effect,

in the newly stolen States of the Church: and all in the name of liberty of conscience and modern civilization.

Bismarck is no fool in his generation, and sees as clearly as any Catholic does or can, that, if children are trained to believe in God and in the obligation to know, reverence, and obey the divine law, as taught, declared, and applied by the church governed and taught by the infallible vicar of Christ, it is in vain that statesmen labor to emancipate conscience from the law of God, and to bring the people to reject in the interior of their souls the entire moral order, and cast off without compunction all authority but that of secular government based on might or force alone. So, as his fourth step, for which he is sure, in advance, of the applause of all the sectarians and seculars of both the Old World and the New, he prohibits priests from being school inspectors, and does whatever lies in his power to exclude the Catholic religion from schools designed especially for Catholics, and to prevent Catholic parents from bringing up their children in their own religion. How destroy the church and secularize the entire Catholic community, if you permit Catholicity to be taught in schools? Bismarck's Protestant brethren and infidel admirers in this country understand this as well as he does, and therefore turn a deaf ear to the protests of Catholics against the injustice of taxing them to support schools to which they cannot, with a good conscience, send their children. And why should they not? Are they not of the modern world which excludes justice, or measures it by utility? Do they not follow the spirit of the age, which Mr. Henry Ward Beecher's *Christian Union* takes as the manifestation of the divine will, and ridicules the Holy Father because he refuses to yield to it, but steadily resists it, as our Lord and his apostles did the spirit of their age and nation?

Still this is not enough: Bismarck has taken a fifth step. This last step, taken, as our liberal journals assure us, in behalf of civil and religious liberty, is to place the discipline of the church, in regard to her own members, under the supervision and control of the civil authority. It prohibits the church from excommunicating or interdicting a priest guilty of heresy, or of any other ecclesiastical or moral offence, without the consent of the government. The principle asserted here, if carried out, destroys at once the freedom and independence of the church, and results in her total destruction in the German empire. It takes away her

authority to govern her own members in purely theological and ecclesiastical matters according to her own laws, and deprives her of all power to purge her own body of unworthy members, or to maintain purity of doctrine or discipline. At one blow it sweeps away all the laws of the church for the government of the faithful, and subjects the church absolutely to the imperial or national authority. She can exist only by the total loss of her unity and catholicity, and by being turned into a national establishment like the church *of* England, which must be distinguished from the church *in* England. This, with the overthrow of the papacy, would be the complete destruction of the Catholic Church, which is the point aimed at.

Now, if we look at these several steps or measures, we shall see they are devised with consummate skill; and taking Bismarck's point of view, that the papal church is a human institution and under purely human control, it is difficult to conceive why they should not prove efficient in the hands of such a leader as Bismarck, and be successful, as Dr. Littlejohn thinks and hopes they will be, in overthrowing the papacy. How can it be otherwise? Bismarck controls Germany, and Germany has prostrated Austria, holds her foot on the neck of France, and dictates the policy of Italy, who holds the pope a prisoner for Bismarck, and is ready at his order to close all communication between the pope and the faithful; Russia is schismatical, and will not interpose in behalf of the pope, nor will England; America cannot, and would not if she could, for she upholds Bismarck with all her sympathies, and earnestly wishes for his success. And why should he not succeed, with all the odds, humanly speaking, in his favor?

Suppose, now, that he succeeds, and the church is swept away, and there are no more popes, bishops, or priests: what is to follow? There will be no longer a voice to be raised in behalf of outraged justice or violated right; no longer a power on earth to assert the supremacy of the moral order, or to vindicate the law of nations. Cæsar triumphs, and the secular order is supreme. Well, has Bismarck ever asked himself, have his pets, the Italian robbers and assassins, worthy descendants of those who upheld the Hohenstaufen against the vicar of Christ, and against the glory and independence of their country, ever asked themselves, if the secular can stand on the secular alone, or civil or civilized society exist without the moral order, without re-

ligion as the *lex suprema* of the nation? And when the church is gone, and *might* takes the place of *right*, who is to assert the moral order, or to sustain religion save as a vague sentiment without moral force, or as a degrading superstition? When conscience is destroyed, by being emancipated from the law of God, what is to sustain government and law, to save society from the most absolute and grinding despotism, or to save men from becoming downright savages or a herd of wild beasts? It is strange how men lose their faculties, and into what wild theories they can rush, when once they give way to their evil passions, and suffer Satan to bewilder and blind them by his delusions.

But we dare tell Dr. Döllinger, Dr. Littlejohn, the *Churchman*, and the Italian robbers and assassins, that, all-powerful as he seems, Prince von Bismarck will not succeed. We disguise not from ourselves or others the gravity of the situation, nor the apparent helplessness of the Holy Father. Human help for him, so far as we can see, there is none; and he is apparently left, as He was whose vicar he is, to tread the wine press alone. Power, wealth, fashion, literature, science, public opinion, the very spirit of the age,—all, all are against him; and yet, without any hesitation, we tell Prince von Bismarck, as Mr. Ward Beecher's journal flippantly told the pope the other day, that "he has undertaken a job too big even for him." Satan has been trying his hand at it eighteen hundred years and more, and with kings and kaisers, princes and people to help him, he has not been able to succeed; and I do not think that Bismarck is stronger than Satan, or able to command more efficient allies. Satan has seemed on the point of succeeding, and flattered himself that he was just a-going to succeed, as a lady said, that "it always seemed to her, when eating vegetable oysters" (salsify), "that she was *just a-going* to taste a real oyster;" but he never gets any further. At that point he always fails, fails shamefully, and leaves his friends in the lurch. The simple fact is, that the church is not a purely human institution; man has not made her, and man cannot unmake her. If Bismarck and his allies had studied and understood history, they would know this, and know that no weapon forged against her can prosper, that his dart will barely strike the boss of her shield and fall harmless at her feet, or rebound and pierce his own heart.

We have seen the church in as great straits as she is in now more than once. She was so under the Arian emper-

ors when, in the strong language of St. Jerome, "the world awoke one morning astonished to find itself Arian." Bismarck does little else than copy the astute policy of Julian the Apostate, and we see no reason why he should succeed in the nineteenth century any better than Julian did in the fourth. After the Arian heresy came resuscitated paganism. So, after the Protestant heresies, we may have revived paganism, for which every heresy is a preparation; but after paganism came orthodoxy in the fourth century, and the most glorious epoch in the church's history. Then came the Basils, the Gregorys, the Chrysostoms, the Hilarys, the Ambroses, the Jeromes, the Augustines, in the splendor of whose virtues the names of the champions of Arianism and paganism have become invisible. The Italians would do well to remember Arnaldo of Brescia who held Rome for ten years, and yet effected nothing against the papacy. Their ancestors drove the popes from Rome, and forced them into what the Romans called the "Babylonian captivity," at Avignon, and occasioned the great schism of the West; and yet, aided as they were by secret societies which covered all Europe then as now, Paulicians, Albigenses, Paterini, and others, that still survive in some of the degrees of freemasonry, they did not succeed in overthrowing the papacy or destroying the church, any more than had done the Kaiser Frederic Barbarossa, whose crushing defeat by Pope Alexander III. the city of Alessandria, in the Subalpine kingdom, was built to commemorate. When Innocent III. was elected pope, Rome was barred against his entrance, and all the great powers of Europe, as now, were in schism and hostile to the papacy; and yet at the close of his pontificate, which lasted sixteen years, all the powers had become submissive to his authority, and never before had the papal throne been more powerful, perhaps, so powerful, throughout the Christian world. His pontificate was the age of great men and great saints. Nor did Frederic II., who included in his empire all Germany, all Italy, except Venice and Florence, and a considerable portion of what is now France, during fifty years of struggle against the papacy, marked on his part by great ability, *finesse*, treachery of every species, lying, perfidy and cruelty not surpassed, if equalled, by the most profligate of the pagan Cæsars, succeed any better than had done his ancestor, Frederic Barbarossa. All Europe at length rose against him. The Holy Father, Innocent IV., if we recollect

aright, in a general council, by virtue of his apostolical authority, the council approving, excommunicated him, deprived him of the imperial dignity, absolved his subjects from their oath of fidelity to him, and he died heart-broken in an obscure village, deserted by all his friends, except one bishop implicated in his condemnation, who, it is said, gave him *in extremis* the last sacraments.

Luther raised what has been called the standard of reform, which was soon favored openly by some, secretly by nearly all the sovereign princes of Europe, and he felt sure of his victory—aided as he was by the Turks, then a great power, and at war with Christendom—over the pope, and declared the papacy was at an end, the reign of Antichrist finished. Yet though as the tail of the Apocalyptic dragon, he drew after him a third part of the stars of heaven, or states of Christendom, the papacy survived, and left the reform to devour her own children. The church also was in as great a strait at the close of the last century, as now. There was not a Catholic power that stood by her; there was less faith in the European populations than even at present; the French revolution, everywhere victorious, swept as a tornado all over Europe, throwing down temples and palaces, thrones and altars, and carrying every thing before it, and leaving only ruins in its track. France beheaded her king, massacred her nobility, or forced them to emigrate, abolished the church, established a constitutional or national church, such as the "Old Catholics" dream of for Germany, suppressed the religious orders, and sent the religious to prison or the guillotine, butchered, drowned, or deported her faithful bishops and priests, invaded by her victorious armies the Italian peninsula, took possession of Rome, dragged the pope from his throne, and hurried him off a prisoner to France, where he soon died at Valence, broken by grief, by age, and by physical suffering; yet the papacy was not overthrown. Hardly less near did Satan seem to victory, when Napoleon I. bestrode all Europe as a conqueror, and dreamed of universal monarchy; or, at least, of making all the princes of Europe vassals of the French empire. He founded the kingdom of Italy for his step-son, placed a brother, and then a brother-in-law, on the throne of Naples, transferred the brother to the throne of Spain, crushed Prussia, rendered Austria powerless, formed the Confederation of the Rhine, with himself at its head, despoiled the pope of his temporal possessions, and held him a prisoner at Savona, and then at

Fontainebleau; and all the world rushed to do him homage. I remember the exultation of the Protestant preachers, and the triumphant air with which, when he cast the pope into prison, they cried out, "Babylon is fallen, the reign of Antichrist is over, the Mystery of Iniquity is ended."

Well, they did not after all taste the oyster. They reckoned without their host. The pope returned amid the joy and acclamations of the people to Rome, recovered his temporal possessions, repaired to a great extent the damage done to them by the revolution, resumed the free exercise of his pontifical powers to the great benefit of the church, and, full of years and heroic virtues, he calmly and peacefully breathed out his pious and noble soul in his own bed, in his own palace; while his persecutor, stript of all his power, denied the imperial dignity, was sent to fret away his life under a brutal English keeper, on the barren rock of St. Helena. Bismarck is reported to have said, that "the pope will find in the present war between him and the empire no Canossa." It is possible; but the few incidents of ecclesiastical history to which we have referred, will suffice to prove that the church is divine, under divine protection, upheld by a divine arm; for if she had been human, standing on human wisdom and strength alone, any one of these would have swept her from the face of the earth. And if our noble pontiff, gloriously reigning though a prisoner, finds not a Canossa, he may find an angel of the Lord, as did St. Peter, opening his prison-doors, setting him free, and bringing to naught the councils of his enemies.

We tell the astute and unscrupulous chancellor, who for the moment wields all the power of the empire, that he will fail as his predecessors have failed. The unarmed, defenceless, and aged prisoner of the Vatican is mightier than he. He may order his obsequious allies, the Italian sacrilegious robbers and assassins, to bar all communication with the Holy Father by the faithful, to rack his aged limbs, and even to slay him; but that will avail him nothing. Every one of the pope's predecessors, including St. Peter himself, for the first three hundred years of our era, suffered martyrdom; I should say, received the martyr's crown, always the crown of victory. Saintly prelates, faithful priests, holy and devoted religious of either sex, may be put to death by the minions of power; but it will avail nothing. Such things strengthen, not weaken, the church. We do not need to cite the promises of Christ to his spouse, promises

which never have failed, and never can fail. Heaven and earth may pass away, but his word cannot pass away. The fair induction from the authentic history of the church for eighteen hundred years is, that, though she may encounter severe struggles, and be obliged to fight terrible battles, no weapon forged against her shall prosper, that she cannot die, that "the immortal years of God are hers," and she will always come forth, like the three children from the fiery furnace, though heated seven times hotter than it is wont to be heated, without the smell of fire on her garments.

The church has stood, for eighteen hundred years and more, the severest tests of her divinity that can possibly be applied. She has been assailed on every side, and that continually. All that human astuteness and craft, despotism and cruelty, aided by satanic malice, could do against her, has been done. Jew, pagan, heretic, schismatic, barbarian, Saracen, apostasy, power, wealth, fashion, science, literature, public opinion, have all, without a moment's relaxation, for eighteen hundred years, assailed her with all their forces, and have failed. What stronger proof can you ask that man has not made her, and that man cannot unmake her? Why is it that the chancellor cannot see it? Why is it that he fails to recognize a Power in and over the universe before which the mightiest power of earth or hell is simply impotence, weakness itself, and that this Power has manifestly upheld and protected the church, and prospered her in spite of all external assaults and internal scandals? Cannot Bismarck read his folly and madness in the fate which has invariably befallen the persecutors of the church in every age and nation? Does he not see that Pius IX., the vigorous old man, is outliving his persecutors, and increases in vigor and courage as he increases in years and as his wrongs and afflictions are multiplied? Where is Palmerston? Dead. Where is Cavour? Dead. Where is Mazzini? Dead. Where is the mock-hero, Garibaldi? Worse than dead. He has outlived his prestige, and serves only to point a jest. Where is Napoleon III., the professed friend and betrayer of the pope? Dead. Who then is left to the chancellor? Victor Emmanuel, Gambetta, and the Internationale. Victor Emmanuel, if he fears not God, at least fears hell; and if the pressure of Prussia was removed, would make his peace with the pope to-morrow, and send his infidel ministers—to their own place. Gambetta's influence is waning, for the Bonapartists have no longer any

need of him to create confusion in France; the Internationale has to bear the infamy of the Paris Commune, and it is a dangerous ally for Bismarck, whose work it will rend in pieces the moment that it sees he is not likely to succeed in destroying the church. Even he himself is checked in his attempt to prussianize Germany, and has alarmed by his ecclesiastical policy the conservative portion of Prussian Protestants, who are beginning to see that it is no less hostile to the Prussian Evangelical church than to the church of Rome; and he must not be surprised to find himself as powerless as his Protestant brother, the Saxon Von Beust, late chancellor of Austria, or if in dying he exclaim, in the words of Julian the Apostate, "Galilean, thou hast conquered!" Who wars against the church wars against God.

WHOSE IS THE CHILD?

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for July, 1873.]

In determining who shall be the educators of our children, or who has authority to determine what education may or may not be given them, it must first be settled, Whose is the Child? Under pagan Rome the child was held to belong to the *paterfamilias*, whose authority over his family, his wife, children, and slaves, was absolute, and could not be interfered with by the city or state. When the empire became Christian, the child was held to belong to the parents, saving the rights of God, of which the church was the guardian and interpreter. Since the empire has ceased, as it has throughout all modern nations, to be Christian, it is held that the child belongs to the state, to the exclusion both of the rights of parents and the rights of God; and therefore it follows that the state has the right to educate, or to determine what education shall or shall not be given the child, as well as who shall give it.

The church has always taught that the child belongs, 1, to God, whose rights she represents; 2, after God, and subordinate to him, the child belongs to the parents; and 3, after the parents, to the state. This is strictly philosophical and follows the real order. God as creator and first cause

of all things visible and invisible, is the absolute owner and proprietor of the universe, and consequently of the child; the parents, being second causes of the child, are its owner, against all claimants, except God himself. The state, as representing society based on the family, and as guardian and protector of the temporal interests of the family and society, has an undeniable claim to the child, subordinate to the parental and the divine rights, but none against them, which are both prior to it, and sacred and inviolable for it. The rights of God and the rights of parents limit and subordinate the rights of the state or society.

This is the Christian order and also the order of creation, or the order in which existences, *mediante* the creative act, proceed from God, the first cause. The church, as the representative of the rights of God in human affairs, whether of individuals or of nations, claims and has always claimed the supreme authority in the bringing up and education of the child, makes and always has made it obligatory on all parents, members of her body, to bring up and educate their children in the faith and practice which God through her enjoins; but, as faith is voluntary and cannot be forced, and as she governs those within, not those without, she leaves non-Catholic parents,—Jews, pagans, Mahometans, and Protestants,—free to bring up their children in their own belief or no-belief, religion or superstition, and even forbids their children to be taken from them and brought up in the Catholic faith against their consent.

The state, representing secular society, its rights and interests, has the right to require that all children should be educated, and to found schools, colleges, and universities, provide sufficient revenues for as full and as extensive an education as is desirable for social interests and the advancement of civilization; but it can itself neither educate, nor determine what education may or may not be given in them. That, for Catholics, is the province of the church; for non-Catholics, who recognize no divinely-instituted teaching church, it is the province of parents whose rights to the child are always paramount to those of the state or society. Such was the order that obtained throughout Christendom till almost our times. Indeed it is very nearly the order that obtained even in pagan Rome. Hostile as the empire before its conversion was to Christianity, I do not find that it ever sought to educate the children of Catholics in paganism, to prevent Catholic parents from having their own

schools, and bringing up their children in their own religion. Julian the Apostate, indeed, closed the imperial schools to Christian teachers and professors, and forbade Christians to read and study the pagan classics and philosophy; but even he respected the rights of parents, and never encouraged, so far as we know, the kidnapping of Christian children and educating them in paganism. That is a refinement which belongs to modern secularism, and never could have obtained even in pagan Rome; for society under pagan, as it ever has been under Christian Rome, was based on the sacredness and inviolability of the rights of the family, or of parental authority.

The progressive ideas so-called of the age have reversed the order asserted by both pagan and Christian tradition. The state takes the first place, the family is resolved into individuals, and the rights of God are rejected as a relic of effete superstition. No religion is allowed that claims to bind the conscience of the state; the family holds from civil society, and the child belongs to the state. Neither God nor the parent has any right to the child, except as a concession from the civil authority. This excludes all right of the parent, and all right of the church, as representing the rights of God, to interfere with the education of the child. The state is the supreme owner of the child, and may take the child by force from the parents, and, if a Catholic child, from the church, and send it to what school it pleases, and bring it up in what religion or no-religion it chooses. This is called civil and religious liberty, that is, the liberation of the state from religion, from all law above itself, or which it does not create and enjoin. It is very much as somebody sung of the proclamation of quiet in Warsaw, when the Russians had suppressed the Polish insurrection in 1831: "They make a solitude, and call it peace." It denies all authority, and calls it liberty.

Some zealous non-Catholic advocates of reformatories, houses of refuge, houses of juvenile delinquents, &c., in their congresses, I am informed, proposed to urge upon the civil authorities to take forcibly the unoffending children of poor and vicious parents not likely to bring them up properly, even against the assent of their parents, and to place them in state institutions, where they will be instructed in the religion or no-religion of the persons selected to manage them; but in all cases, except when they are sent to institutions under Catholic control, they are likely, as ex-

perience proves, to grow up worse members of society than they would have done had they not been taken from their parents. Non-Catholic reformatory institutions, whether state or sectarian, are never successful reformers either of the young or the old, of individuals or of society, in morals or politics. The intention of non-Catholic reformers may be good, their sentiments benevolent, and their liberality large, but their institutions seem always to lack the blessing of God, and their subjects, when they come out, are, as a rule, covetous and dishonest, infidels or fanatics, without any true or fixed principles. Then it is a great mistake to suppose that the class from which these are taken, is the most dangerous class in our cities. Drunkenness is a vice and a sin, but it is not confined to the lower class, nor is it more hurtful to the soul, or destructive to society, than pride and covetousness. There is not less virtue in the so-called lower classes than in the so-called upper classes; and the children of those we call the poor and vicious, are not worse brought up than the children of the rich and fashionable. The really alarming feature of our society is the constant growth of corruption and wickedness, of vice and crime, in high places. The extravagance of shoddy and petroleum, the frauds of bank presidents, cashiers, and tellers, of railroad directors and managers, the failure of banks, especially of savings banks, to say nothing of the corruptions in congress, state legislatures, and municipal governments, are a thousand times more threatening to the state, to society, than intemperance, thieving, robbery, and murder, so appalling among what are called "the dangerous classes" of our cities and towns.

If we make the state supreme in morals and education, nothing is to be said against taking away the children whose parents, whether rich or poor, educated or uneducated, fashionable or unfashionable, seem to the police to be incompetent to bring up their children in virtuous habits, and sending them to a protectory or a house of refuge; but if we accept the rule given by Christian tradition, we can send none without the consent of their parents, who have not committed some offence punishable by law, nor even then send them, without the same consent, to institutions in which ample provision is not made for their being trained in the religion of their parents. But we are insisting on rights which, we have said, are no longer recognized, except by Catholics. The modern spirit absorbs all rights in the

rights of the state. It secularizes all rights, in order to secularize all education, and aims to secularize all education in order to get rid of all religion that does not hold from the state, or, as we Americans say, from the people. Its design, with the leaders of public opinion, is to get rid of religion and train up children and youth in pure secularism, only another name for atheism; for what else is the assertion of the supremacy of the state, of the secular, or of the human order, but the denial of God; since, to deny the supreme dominion of God, or the supreme dominion of "the Word made flesh," is as much atheism as the denial of the being of God? The establishment in England makes a feeble stand against secularism, but ineffectually; because it itself holds from the secular, the queen, lords, and commons, and has itself only a secular authority. The conservative Protestant party in Prussia oppose the complete secularization of education; but ineffectually, for the same reason. The Evangelical church of Prussia is a creature of the state, created by Frederic William III., and depends on the crown for its very existence; and it has on its own principles no ground on which it can make a logical stand against the destructive policy of Bismarck.

In our own country the demand is for unsectarian education, which means, on the one hand, a purely secular education, and on the other, an anti-Catholic and decidedly Protestant education, even for the children of Catholics. Governor Dix, in his message to the legislature of New York, recommends the discontinuance of all appropriations from the public funds for the aid or support of sectarian schools, or any other than state institutions. This looks fair enough on its face, but it is really directed against Catholics, and Catholics alone; because all educational, correctional, and eleemosynary establishments, under the immediate control of the state and supported by it, are just as much sectarian institutions as those placed avowedly under the control of some particular Protestant sect, because the American public, when not purely secular, is unmistakably sectarian, that is, Protestant. The public schools are either godless or sectarian, though controlled by no one particular Protestant sect. They are not schools that Catholics, though taxed for their support, can use, unless willing to expose their children to the loss of their Catholic faith and morals; because they teach things the Catholic Church condemns, and fail to teach, or to permit us to teach, in them what she requires all her children to be taught.

The state is free to make provision for the education of all the children in the land or not, as it sees proper: so much is within its province, as supreme in temporals; but it has no right to tax the whole people, or use funds belonging to the whole people, to establish and sustain schools which only part, though by far the larger part, of the people, can use with a good conscience. If it acknowledges the law of justice, it must respect the conscience of the minority, as well as the conscience of the majority; and then, if it decides to make provision at the public expense for the education of all the children within its territory, it must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority. The majority, including secularists and Protestants of all denominations, are, it would seem, satisfied with the system as it is: let them have it; nobody wishes to interfere with them; but as the Catholic minority are deprived of their rights by it, the state should divide the public schools, and give Catholics their proportion, to be, in all that concerns the selection of instructors, the education given, discipline maintained, under their exclusive control and management; which means, we grant, under the control of the Catholic pastors, who represent for Catholics the rights of God, which include, *eminenter*, the rights both of parents and society, since he is sole first cause, and *causa causarum*. This would only place the Catholic minority, as to the rights of conscience, equally sacred and inviolable for all before the state, on the same footing with the majority. The secularists and Protestants would have their consciences or no-consciences respected; and the rights of God and of parents, so far as regards the Catholic minority, would be acknowledged without lesion to the rights of the state or of society.

But this, though just and equal, would not be satisfactory to the secularists and the majority of Protestants, for it would deprive them of their strongest reason for supporting the system of what they call non-sectarian schools; that is, schools from which all positive or concrete religion is excluded. The secularists support the system, because they would get rid of all religion, obliterate from the minds and hearts of the people all traces of Christian tradition, or, in their own language, "superstition;" the Protestants maintain the system, because they hold it to be anti-Catholic, the most effectual means that can be adopted to detach the children of Catholic parents from the Catholic faith and

worship, and to prevent the church from gaining a permanent footing in this country, and from extending her influence over any considerable portion of the native-born American people. The division of the public schools, and the assignment to Catholics of their *pro rata* portion, would operate to the defeat of the cherished plans and purposes of both sections of the non-Catholic majority; and having the power, we may be sure that they will never consent to the division. That it would be just, and is demanded by the equal rights on which our republic is founded, and which it boasts of maintaining, counts with them for nothing. Equality, in the vocabulary of the ruling majority, means their superiority, and their right to have their will govern. Is not the supremacy of the majority, or that the majority must govern, asserted by the democratic principle? Is not the democratic principle asserted by the progressive spirit of the age? And does not Mr. Ward Beecher's *Christian Union* assure us that "the progressive spirit of the age is providential, divine, and that the pope in resisting it is as foolish as he would be, should he attempt to arrest and roll back the solar system"?

The majority of our non-Catholic countrymen, if free to follow their natural sense of justice, would, no doubt, give to us our portion of the public schools; but the people cannot act without their leaders, and, in the present case, their leaders are restrained by no considerations of right or justice. This is necessarily the case with secularists, whose only measure of right is might; which Lord Arundel of Wardour shows when applied to government, resolves itself into the rule of force, as was proved in the old French revolution, and has been proved again in the late Paris commune, and by the liberals in Italy, Spain, Germany, and wherever they have power. Their fixed purpose is to eliminate religion—to which belong all such ideas as right, justice, duty—from society, from the human mind, and from law and government; and whatever may be the instincts of the people, their *liberal* leaders will never favor or suffer them to favor, as far as they can control them, a measure whose direct tendency is to defeat that fixed purpose. When Catholics were few and weak in the country, and no apprehensions were felt that the church could ever become a power here, the liberals were willing to encourage and even favor them, as a sort of battering-ram against Protestantism, supposed by them to be the chief defence of religion against

no-religion. I was then one of them, be it said to my shame, and such was my own view, and that of those with whom I was associated. "The Catholic Church," we said among ourselves, "is really dead, or fallen into the past, and can never again be a power in any land; we can therefore favor it without danger to our ulterior purpose, and use it advantageously to demolish weak, illogical, absurd, but arrogant and insolent Protestantism:" and there were some Catholics silly enough to suppose that we were their natural allies. But that was between forty and fifty years ago, and American, as well as European, liberals now understand that their natural alliance is with Protestants, not with Catholics; for the church, not Protestantism, is the bulwark of religion and the defender of Christian tradition. Times have changed. The wonderful growth of the church amongst us has opened their eyes and startled them, and they see it is the church, not Protestantism, that is in their way. As much as they hate the leading sects, such as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, &c., and despise the minor sects, Unitarians, Universalists, &c., they see that they have natural allies in them, and that the church alone is to be dreaded; and they are now, with individual exceptions, here as elsewhere, our bitterest enemies.

The fixed purpose of Protestants is to prevent the growth of the church in this country; and the very reasons which induce us to demand a division of the public schools are the reasons which do and will, as long as they with their infidel allies have the power, induce them to resist it. Bent on preventing this from becoming a great Catholic country, they will do nothing knowingly to favor the church, and will scruple at no violation of truth, or outrage of right and every principle of justice, needed in their judgment to hinder her growth, and, if possible, to sweep her from the land. They would, if we can judge from their acts at home or abroad, much rather that Catholics should become infidels, downright apostates, than remain Catholics. They evidently regard the church as more to be dreaded than pure secularism, or downright atheism. Whether it is that the developments of Protestantism have brought Protestants to feel that they and unmitigated secularists belong to one and the same family, or whether they think it easier to make good Protestants out of infidels than out of Catholics well instructed in their religion, it is not for us to say; but of this we are quite sure, that they willingly act as the firm

allies of the secularists in the war to the knife against the Catholic Church, and seem not to be much concerned lest the victory, if won, should inure principally to the advantage of their allies. *À bas l'église!* is their battle-cry, and they seem to take no thought for what may come after. They fear not infidelity, but the church they evidently do fear; and will use the state against her in such ways as they believe will be most damaging to her, so long as they are able to wield its power.

There are honest men, well-disposed men, men who are neither bigots nor fanatics, among our Protestant countrymen, men who see and love justice, and would not willingly wrong Catholics or any other class of citizens, and we believe, if it came to counting noses, they would be found to be the majority even of Protestants; but they cannot well withdraw from the influence of the Protestant leaders, who deceive them with regard to the purposes of the church, and make them believe that patriotism and devotion to civil and religious liberty require them to oppose her. This they can the more easily do, because the history which Protestants read is, so far as concerns the church, as somebody has said, only a "conspiracy against truth," and is little else than a tissue of false statements and misrepresentations. In fact, no non-Catholic can possibly write a true history of the church, for he has not the key to the meaning of the facts he encounters. There is a Protestant tradition admirably described and hit off by Dr. Newman in one of his discourses, in the light, or rather, darkness of which Protestants all but universally read ecclesiastical history. The Protestant leaders, appealing to this Protestant tradition, which originated in falsehood and misrepresentation, and the grossest calumnies, are able to carry with them the great body of the Protestant people in spite of their honest intentions and natural sense of justice. We see, then, as the *Review* has always asserted, little chance of inducing the Protestant and secularist majority to grant us justice, either by giving us our proportion of the public schools, or remitting the tax now levied on us for the support of schools from which our religion is excluded, and in which no religion, or what we hold to be a false religion, is permitted to be taught.

We Catholics could submit to the injustice of being taxed to support anticatholic schools as we now are—for purely secular schools are as decidedly anticatholic, as purely sec-

tarian schools—if left free to establish schools of our own at our own expense, as we are now doing; but there is a movement on foot to deprive us even of this degree of freedom, which is going a step further than pagan Rome ever went; for none of the pagan Cæsars ever made attendance on the great imperial schools obligatory on Christians, or prohibited Christians from establishing and maintaining Christian schools at their own expense. Yet we find a movement commenced in what Mr. Wilson, recently installed as vice-president of the United States, calls "New Departure of the Republican Party," the party now in power as well as in place, to establish, in utter disregard of the constitution, by the general government, a system of national compulsory education, which must be either Protestant or purely secular, in any case, anticatholic. This measure carried, the next will be the suppression of Catholic parochial schools, academies, colleges, and universities, and the prohibition of the Jesuits, the Redemptorists, the Lazarists, the Visitandines, the Ursulines, the Sisters of Charity, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, and other teaching orders and congregations, male or female, from receiving pupils, and, perhaps, even from residing in the country. The next step will be to suppress the freedom of the church in the Union, and of Catholic faith and worship. Bismarck has done or is doing it in Germany, and causing it to be done in Switzerland and Italy, and wherever the so-called liberal, progressive, or advanced party is in the ascendency. Congressional legislation and the proposed policy of the administration show that the federal government is prepared to act on the principle that, if carried out, would go to the full length we have supposed. The Protestant leaders, the Wilsons, the Dodges, the Pomeroys, the Colfaxes, the Bellowses, the American and Foreign Christian Union, the Evangelical Alliance, the Young Men's Christian Union, American Bible and Tract societies, the Home and Foreign Missionary Society, the Union League, Freemasons, Odd Fellows, the Internationale, and the "thousand and one" other associations, leagues, and unions, some open, some secret, some hostile to all religion, some holding on to the Christian name, but all deadly enemies of the church, are prepared, and busy at work preparing the American people, to go that length. It is the Mormons to-day; it will be the turn of the Catholics to-morrow. Yet we were scandalized the other day to find the announcement in the papers, that

Wendell Phillips, the open, public defender of the infamous Paris Commune, led on by the chiefs of the Internationale, had been invited to give a lecture, or had given a lecture, before the Catholic Union, in this city—a union formed, we had supposed, expressly to sustain the Holy Father in the sacrilegious war waged by Protestants, infidels, radicals, communists, and despots against him. What concord can there be between Christ and Belial? The liberal is a worse, a more dangerous enemy, to the church to-day, however it may have been fifty years ago, than the most bigoted Protestant, for he seeks to betray us with a kiss.

We have stated clearly, explicitly, and truthfully, the actual and prospective difficulties in the way of carrying out the principle of justice to Catholics on the subject of education. We have right, justice, and true patriotism on our side; but it seems at present useless to appeal to these motives, for they are motives that the spirit of the age laughs to scorn. Yet we do not believe that Catholic schools will be suppressed, the freedom of education abridged, or the members of religious orders and congregations banished or forbidden to exercise their vocation to teach. The *vis inertiæ* of the great body of the people, if nothing else, will prevent it till it is too late. We now are affected by sympathy with the anticatholic and reform movements in the Old World; but those movements will soon be seen to tend only to anarchy or despotism, and a reaction against them in the Old World, which will be almost instantly followed by reaction here, must come, if not already begun; and I hope, old as I am, to live long enough to see renewed the scenes of rejoicing at the downfall of Bismarck and the restoration of the pope, exhibited by my countrymen on the downfall of Napoleon I. and the restoration of Pius VII. and the Bourbons, which I witnessed in my boyhood. I was too young to comprehend their significance, but not too young to remember the tears of joy that filled the eyes of the veterans of the war of independence and the previous "French war," from whom I learned lessons in patriotism and liberty I have never forgotten, and which I have endeavored to teach my children. Satan has succeeded in deceiving the nations, and is waging a fierce war against the church; but, as we have before stated, he is destined to defeat. He may bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, but she shall crush his head.

This New World was discovered by Catholics and taken possession of in the name of the cross, and we cannot get it out of our head that the cross will yet claim and obtain possession of its own. We believe that this continent is destined to be the inheritance of God's dear Son, and this country to be rendered eternally glorious as one of the principal seats of Catholicity. We expect it, not indeed from human wisdom, human sagacity, or human effort; God will bring it about in his own way and time, and by means that we discern not, but which will seem marvellous in our eyes for their simplicity and naturalness. With all their sympathy with the wild and destructive theories and speculations of the age, the mass of the American people at bottom hate anarchy and despotism, and are devoted to liberty without license. Events are rapidly demonstrating to them that the revolutionary party with which they have very naturally and warmly sympathized, cannot found a true orderly liberty; that, while it cuts society loose from its old moorings, it leaves it to float alternately between anarchy and despotism. The generation, exhausted and disgusted with anarchy, its confusion, bloodshed, and insecurity for person and property, ceases to struggle, and yields to the despot or the adventurer who has force on his side, and who assures them, as did Louis Napoleon, that "the empire is peace." A new generation comes upon the stage, clamors, conspires anew for liberty, overthrows the empire, which few regret, struggles till exhausted like its predecessor, and then yields its neck to the yoke of the despot, who will allow it only the liberty to blaspheme God and revile his church. What is going on in Europe now will also demonstrate to them that no political order can be permanent and protect liberty, either civil or religious, that is not based on the moral order of the universe, and supported by the conscience of the people, both collectively and individually; and we think events, whose logic is invincible, will bring home to them that this moral order must have a divinely appointed and assisted authority, independent alike of the nation and the individual, the government and the citizen, to guide and direct, strengthen and sustain conscience in its support of sound morals and true liberty, that is, liberty by authority and authority with liberty.

Trusting that such will be the case, we, as Catholics, must, whatever our present discouragements, continue to assert, as we have begun by defining them, the rights of

God represented by the church, the rights of the family represented by the parent, and the rights of society represented by the state, defined, consecrated, and placed under the protection of conscience by the church. Our demands will be unheeded or resisted to-day, will be scoffed at by public opinion, but we must not falter; we must persist in proclaiming the right and in demanding justice, and only justice; and the time will come when we shall be listened to, when He in whom we trust will come to be heard and enable us to save liberty, authority, and society, as well as our own souls.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for July, 1873.]

This sermon derives a value, in addition to its own intrinsic merits, from the fact that its author was one of the respectable minority in the Council of the Vatican, who opposed the definition of the papal infallibility on the ground of its inopportuneness. However it might be with some others, he distinctly states that he did not oppose the definition on the ground that he did not believe the doctrine, for he believed, always had believed it, and, as a professor of theology, had taught it; but solely on the ground that he doubted the expediency of defining it. It is but fair to let the bishop speak for himself. After having shown that the doctrine of the papal infallibility is no new doctrine, but has always in fact been the faith of the church, he proceeds:

"But some will say that if this doctrine of the infallible teaching of the Roman pontiff was a doctrine always believed by the church, why was it that there was so much diversity of opinion in regard to it among the fathers of the council? To this objection I will say, that this diversity of opinion was not on the doctrine itself, but on the expediency or inexpediency of making a definition on this doctrine. This was the principal cause of the diversity of opinion; but this did not affect, in the least, the dogma itself.

**Papal Infallibility.* Extracts of a Sermon preached by the Rt. Rev. M. Domenec, Bishop of Pittsburgh, after his return from the Vatican Council. Pittsburgh: 1873.

"As an illustration of this, I give myself as an example. I was one of the prelates of the council who was opposed, most vigorously, to this doctrine being defined. I signed my name to a petition which we addressed to the Holy Father, imploring and begging of him not to allow this question to be introduced into the council, and I did all I could to prevent its definition; but does this prove that I did not believe in the infallible teaching of the Roman pontiff previous to its definition in the Vatican Council? Not at all.

"For many years, as professor of theology in the Theological Seminary of Philadelphia, and elsewhere, I taught the doctrine of infallibility as defined in the Vatican Council. In 1864, in a Pastoral Letter which I wrote to the faithful of my diocese, I taught and explained that doctrine. Here are the words which I then spoke:—

"'But one of the most important offices of the Roman pontiff is to confirm all in the faith. How significant and sublime is the passage of scripture in which this office is imparted to Peter and his successors: "And the Lord said Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." Yes, Satan, the father of lies, of sin, and iniquity, has desired to have *you*, not merely thee, but you, my apostles and my followers, my sheep, my entire church; he who is the father of lies, sin, and iniquity, has desired to have and annihilate the church, which is the pillar of truth, the mother of the faithful, of the just, and of the saints. What help, what protection, has the church to defend itself against the attacks of Satan? The help and protection of the church to foil and destroy the efforts of the enemy, is Peter and his successors. The Lord said: "Simon, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." In spite of all the evil desires and efforts of Satan, the faith of Peter shall never fail; his faith, by the prayers of the Son of God, is made secure and firm; and thus Peter, ever firm in his faith, is to confirm all his brethren in the faith. How glorious, how sublime is this office of the Roman Pontiffs, as successors of St. Peter!'

"And in another place we thus spoke:

"'Yes, the power of the popes shall never die. The pope shall, till the end of time, sit on the chair of Peter, invested with power divine, to diffuse throughout the world the light of Christian faith. Sooner shall the natural sun be extinguished—be blotted out of the heavens—cease to exist—than the power of the popes become extinct. The same God who said, "Let there be lights made in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth," has declared to Peter, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; confirm thy brethren." Sooner, then, shall the natural sun cease to give light upon the earth, than the successors of Peter to enlighten the world with the rays of Christian faith.'

"Do not these passages prove that I held firmly to the doctrine of infallibility? and yet I was an opponent to the opportunity of its definition."

This is clear enough, and proves satisfactorily that the illustrious bishop of Pittsburgh held the doctrine prior to its formal definition by the council, and we presume such was the fact with all or nearly all of the inopportunists. But even if they had previously doubted it, there could be no ground for the charge of inconsistency or insincerity in their adhesion.

to the definition after it was made and thus proved to be the voice of the infallible church; that is to say, of the Holy Ghost speaking in and through the council. Every Catholic, whatever he might have thought before, knows by the decision of the highest authority what is the faith, and forfeits his character as a Catholic if he refuses to hear the church, and to accept, *ex animo*, what he now knows is the faith, "once delivered to the saints." In accepting it, he only acts in perfect consistency with his Catholic profession, which requires him to believe whatever the church believes and teaches, and shows that, though he may have erred, it was never through an heretical spirit, or contempt of the Holy Ghost who dwells in the church and speaks in her voice.

The condemnation of Döllinger and his adherents is not that they doubted or denied the papal infallibility before the definition of the council; for though they erred against faith and were material heretics, they were not formal heretics, as say the theologians, and did not necessarily incur the guilt of heresy. Their condemnation is in their refusal to hear the church, and in setting up their private judgment against her catholic authority because by their refusal they prove that, before the definition as well as since, they were governed by an heretical spirit. In opposing the definition, now that it is made, they simply oppose the Catholic faith, and prove that they were not loyal sons of the church, for they prove they held their own judgment paramount to hers. They act as if the church should hear them, not they the church. If they had been loyal Catholics they would have felt it no hardship to renounce their former error, and cheerfully to accept the faith as defined by the church. But as they refused, we must say of them, in the words of the apostle, "They went out from us, because they were not of us."

But since the Council of the Vatican overruled the objections of the inopportunists, the venerable bishop of Pittsburgh we trust will permit us to say, with all deference, that we think the council was wise and prudent in so doing. True wisdom and prudence were on the side of the majority, and the majority in our judgment showed that they understood far better the necessities of the times, and the true interests of the church in modern society, than did the very able and respectable minority. This is a question not of faith, but of prudence, and is therefore a question open, or, prior to the definition, was open to discussion, and we are certainly free to examine the reasons alleged by the minority against

the prudence or opportuneness of the definition. The question of prudence, as distinct from the question of faith, has two sides: the one, the bearing of the measure on Catholics themselves; the other, its bearing on non-Catholics and secular society. This first side of the question, its bearing on Catholics themselves, the inopportunists seem to us to have overlooked. It seems never to have occurred to them, that Catholics needed the definition, and were suffering greatly for the want of it. It is only necessary to recall to mind the state of the Catholic public, revealed by the publication in December, 1864, of the syllabus of condemned propositions. All or nearly all of those propositions had been put forth or defended by professedly Catholic writers, and these not obscure, insignificant, or uninfluential writers, but for the most part writers of distinction, not a few of them professors in colleges and seminaries of philosophy, history, theology, and canon law; others were journalists, statesmen, and influential politicians, jurists, and courtiers. Some of them were put forth or defended by Döllinger and his school in Germany; some by such periodicals as *The Home and Foreign Review* in England; and others were defended by the canonists of Turin, by Count Cavour and his followers in Italy, by Count de Montalembert and Père Gratry in France, and generally by the whole party of so-called liberal Catholics, or Catholics who held that the church should form an alliance with liberalism and conciliate Catholicity with modern civilization. The pope had previously, in encyclicals, allocutions, and special bulls, condemned them all, and almost without effect. They were still defended, and gained currency, and threatened to deprive the church of all living teaching authority. It was hardly safe for a poor layman like ourselves to assert the supremacy of the spiritual order, and the subordination of the temporal to the eternal, unless in some vague and indeterminate sense.

When the syllabus was published, there was a universal outcry against it. Liberal Catholics, when they did not venture to condemn it outright, would privately express their appreciation of it by saying they were sorry it had been published; Catholic governments very generally declared against it, and nothing was more evident than that large numbers of the faithful in all countries had been drifting away from the faith, and had retained at best only a weak and diluted Catholicity, without robustness or energy,

and utterly unable to withstand a conflict with the world. The evil was a great and growing one; political atheism was almost as prevalent among Catholics as among non-Catholics, and could not be arrested on Gallican principles, which asserted church and state as two coördinate powers. Yet though we were free to defend the papal supremacy and infallibility as an opinion, even as the more probable opinion, we were not free to defend either as of Catholic faith. We were obliged to recognize Gallicans as Catholics: at least so we were personally taught. Whatever, then, might be our own personal convictions, we could insist on nothing as essential to Catholic faith that was denied by Gallicans, and therefore on nothing that would tend to arrest the spread of political atheism among the Catholic laity; for political atheism is only the logical development of the four articles of the French clergy of 1682. It is true we were not obliged to believe those articles, but were practically no better off than if we had been: for we were not at liberty to assert the contradictory as *de fide*, but only as an opinion, which in practice could amount to nothing.

We were besought by a good Jesuit father, the president of a college in Dublin, to reply to a specious article in the *Edinburgh Review*, entitled *Ultramontane Doubts*. The reply was simple and easy, if we could reject Gallicanism, and answer on ultramontane principles; but it was unanswerable on Gallican principles, or if we must concede that Gallicanism is compatible with Catholic faith. "I regret," said the bishop, whom we consulted on the occasion, "that we cannot treat Gallicanism as a heresy, but we are not free to do that; and you must make the best reply you can without condemning the Gallican doctrine." We made the best reply we could, but one very unsatisfactory to ourselves.* When afterwards we broke out and ventured to assert the supremacy and infallibility of the pope, as vicar of Christ, or representative on earth of the spiritual order which, by its own nature, is supreme over the temporal, thus giving political atheism its death-blow, bishops, priests, and laymen, almost with one accord, cried out against us, and charged us with going "too far." We regret we did not persevere and fight the battle out on the line we had taken up, layman as we were; but we dared not, though we never gave up our convictions or contradicted them.

*See Vol. X., pp. 328, *et seq.*

The article referred to in the *Edinburgh Review*, if I recollect aright, asked, Where in the Catholic Church is the seat of Infallibility? The ultramontane says, In the pope; the Gallican denies it. Is the Gallican a Catholic or not? We need not say, we dared not say, he was not a Catholic, though we held him to be a Manichean, and therefore we could not give the ultramontane answer as Catholic faith, and it was of no use to give it as an opinion to an outsider. We were forced then to give the Gallican answer, and to tell the *Edinburgh Review* that the seat of infallibility is in the bishops, either as congregated in council or as dispersed, each one teaching in his own diocese. But this made the church episcopal, not papal, and denied, by implication, that our Lord founded his church on Peter. Besides, it deprived the church of the note of unity, by virtually denying it any centre of authority. The necessity of communion with the successor of Peter was an inconsequence on Gallican principles. Such communion could be a pledge of unity, of doctrine, or of authority, only on condition that the pope as successor of Peter was the supreme governor and infallible teacher of the universal church. Where, if the supreme authority and infallibility are vested in the bishops assembled in council,—where is the authority to say what bishops are or are not schismatical or heretical, and what bishops have or have not the right to sit and vote in the council? A second difficulty arose. No Gallican pretended that the bishops were individually infallible. If not individually, they could not be collectively. Our Lord promised Peter that his faith should not fail, and that the church should not fail, but because built on him. There was no promise of the assistance of the Holy Ghost to the council save through Peter; and if Peter's faith could fail, there was no ground to believe the council infallible. And we know that numerous assemblies of bishops held without the pope are not infallible, because they have contradicted one another, and no such assemblies have ever been recognized as general councils. Without the infallibility of the pope, the successor of Peter in the see of Rome, we could not maintain the infallibility of councils.

A third difficulty embarrassed us. All Catholics in their controversies with Protestants, who place infallibility in the Bible, and deny it to the church, while asserting the infallibility of the written word in the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, claim to have in the church a living and ever-present

infallible teacher, competent to declare the whole word of God, at all times and for all persons. But the council is not in permanent session. Three hundred years elapsed before the first general council, that of Nicæa, was convoked, and three hundred years have passed since the last, the Council of Trent. Where during the first three hundred, or the last three hundred years, to say nothing of the long intervals when no council was in session, was this *living and always present* infallible teacher?

But turn now to the *ecclesia dispersa*, to the bishops teaching, each one in his own diocese. As each bishop may err, only that which all the bishops scattered over the whole world agree with one another in teaching as "the faith once delivered to the saints," can be received as infallibly of faith, and held as the word of God. Now how am I, or how is my uneducated brother, to ascertain what all the bishops through the whole world agree with one another in teaching as of faith, and to ascertain it with infallible certainty? The thing is impossible. Hence we never felt able to maintain the infallibility of the church on Gallican principles, or without asserting the infallibility of the pope as defined in the Council of the Vatican.

Now these and other considerations prove that on the side of Catholics the definition was eminently prudent, and, if not opportune, it was because it had been delayed too long. It was needed to call Catholics to the true conception of the church which they were fast losing. In all old Catholic populations, there has been a manifest decline in vigorous faith and robust piety, since the latter half of the seventeenth century, and especially since, in obedience to the court, the great Bossuet drew up the four articles, and gave a formula to the doctrine held by the sovereigns in distinction from the doctrine held by the church. The historian has no difficulty in tracing the old French revolution and all its horrors, as well as the century of revolutions, anarchy, and despotism which has followed it in Catholic Europe, to the principles of the four articles of 1682. Bossuet rendered important services to the church, but his servility to Cæsar more than cancelled them. Two of the greatest revolutionists of modern times were Colbert, the minister of Louis XIV., and the learned and eloquent bishop of Meaux. By the declaration of the Gallican clergy, they emancipated the state from the law of God, and deprived the pope of the power to protect and vindicate public morals, and arrest

the spread of political atheism, or political lawlessness. They denied him infallibility, and all right to subject kings, princes, states, and statesmen to the divine law of which he is the divinely instituted guardian and judge. What could he do? The revolutionists were seeking only a secular end, in regard to which the Holy Father has no authority, Gallicanism asserted; and it is Gallicanism that has emasculated Catholicity, ruined the old Catholic nations of Europe, and secured the balance of power to the Protestant powers, and spread far and wide the impression that Catholicity is incompatible with the greatness and glory of nations—an impression almost impossible to efface.

Now we think, with all deference to the inopportunists, and without for a moment questioning their Catholic earnestness or intentions, that they forgot, in their anxiety to avoid giving offence to Cæsar and his Protestant and infidel allies, that Peter had received from our Lord the command to confirm his brethren, that they neglected to consider the terrible evils that were preying upon the Catholic body, and failed to discern their causes, as well as the means of remedying them. Reforms, no doubt, were needed, but no reforms in discipline and details could effect any thing unless the council laid the axe at the root of the tree, or crushed the hydra-headed monster of Gallicanism with its anathema, and declared, what had always been the faith of the church, the supremacy of governing and infallibility in teaching the universal church of the Roman pontiff, the successor of Peter and true vicar of Christ on earth. So much for the Catholic side of the question, which the inopportunists neglected to consider. We turn now to the Protestant and non-Catholic side, which appears to have chiefly affected them.

Bishop Domenec, prior to the definition, was evidently moved by his fears of the effect it would have on non-Catholics, more than by his hopes of its probable effects on Catholics themselves.

He says:—

"Now, the reason why I was so much opposed to the defining of this doctrine of infallibility was, because I feared that many of *our dissenting brethren* would make use of this definition to oppose the Catholic Church; that many who were favorably disposed towards the Catholic Church might change their views; that the infidel and unbeliever would rather scorn and ridicule, than to bring them to our faith and religion. I was convinced in my very heart and soul, that that definition would

be rather detrimental than beneficial; that the enemies of the Catholic Church would give a wrong interpretation to its meaning; that through the pulpit and the press false statements would be conveyed to the minds of many, who thereby would be embittered against the Catholic Church, and the breach which separates Protestantism from Catholicity would become deeper and wider, and the chances of conversion, either among Protestants or infidels, would be far less. These being my convictions I could not act otherwise than what I did."

Yet the bishop must permit us to doubt if in this he adopted the highest Catholic principle, or even the course really the most prudent with regard to those outside of the Catholic communion. We have observed, in our intercourse with Protestants, that they distrust our sincerity, honesty, and perfect frankness in declaring our doctrines, more than they do the truth of our doctrines themselves. "I could accept without much difficulty," said an able and learned Protestant minister to me while I was yet a Protestant, "Charles Butler's *Book of the Church*, which I have just read, if I could believe it a fair and honest statement of Catholic doctrine. But I cannot believe it, and he seems to me to trim throughout, and to dress up his church to commend her to Protestants, while in reality she is something very different." Protestants make few objections to Gallicanism, for they see no radical difference between it and Protestantism; but I have never met a Protestant of ordinary intelligence who fully believed Gallicanism to be an authentic presentment of the real faith of the Catholic Church. I was brought up among ignorant and bigoted New-England Puritans, but the first impression on my mind, when yet a mere child, was that Catholics hold the pope to be infallible. We no doubt disarm, to a certain extent, opposition by our concessions to the prejudices and errors of non-Catholics, or by withholding the truths which more particularly offend them; but we win, by so doing, neither their confidence nor their respect. We do not facilitate their conversion, or render them a whit more favorable to the church herself. They pat liberal Catholics, intelligent and enlightened Catholics, as they call them, on the back and say: "Good fellow, we esteem you, hold you to be nearly as good as one of us, and if all Catholics were like you, we should have no serious objection to the spread of your religion in our country." Who ever heard of these liberal, intelligent, and enlightened Catholics, who say to Protestants, as the amiable and polite Bishop Cheverus was

accustomed to say to them, "Only a paper wall separates us," being persecuted by infidels or Protestants? Many Protestants of Boston joined this excellent prelate's church, as they would join Dr. Channing's church, or as they join Ward Beecher's church, but very few of them joined the *Catholic* Church, and nearly all of them returned to some one or another Protestant congregation when the good bishop returned, at the order of his king, to his native France. Who persecutes the "Old Catholics"? The authorities protect them, the whole Protestant world pets them, and, at the same time, despises them.

It is Catholicity in its strength, not in its weakness, in its fulness, not as pared down and shorn of its power so as to offer nothing to offend the narrow-minded and puerile prejudices of a godless age or nation, that wins the victory. Our Holy Father, Pius IX., now gloriously reigning, though a prisoner, has said, on more occasions than one, that the calamities that have befallen Catholic nations are due to liberal Catholics. We know that it was the liberal Catholics of Italy, France, Switzerland, Germany, and Spain, that instigated the opposition of the courts to the syllabus and the decrees of the Vatican, and brought upon the church the present fearful persecution. It was, if we are rightly informed, a liberal Catholic, who drew up the statute adopted by the imperial parliament of Germany against the Jesuits and kindred orders. In every age of the church her worst enemies have been of her own household, bent on effecting a compromise with the prince of this world, with Cæsar, with the spirit of the age, and fearing men who can only kill the body, rather than Him who hath power to destroy both soul and body in hell. In the early ages of the church the *disciplina arcani* was practicable and wise, for it saved the mysteries from being profaned by the infidels; but it is wholly useless and impracticable now when the mysteries have, in thousands and tens of thousands of volumes, been explained and published to all the world, and, besides, the fullest instruction was always given to the faithful. The only true prudence now is the courage that stands boldly by the whole Catholic truth, and refuses all compromises or the slightest concession, let it please or displease whom it may. It is the truth that liberates us, it is the truth that conquers; and our might as Catholics is in the truth we hold and fearlessly proclaim, whether men will bear or forbear.

While, therefore, we can understand and appreciate the motives and reasonings of the inopportunists in the council, we think, on the question of prudence, even so far as the conversion of heretics is concerned, they made a mistake, or showed a want of due confidence in what they acknowledged to be the truth. Yielding, against our better judgment, to the advice of our friends, for three or four years before the suspension of our *Review* we tried the conciliatory policy, and kept back the stronger and more offensive features of the Catholic faith. The effect was that Catholics began to distrust us, and non-Catholics were delighted, and waited to see us soon become again one of themselves. They took us to be on their side, and fighting their battles against the church. We learned then that there is a prudence that overshoots itself, and becomes the greatest imprudence. The dictates of timidity are often mistaken for the dictates of prudence. When we study the history of the church, and mark the timidity and weakness that, under the name of prudence, have so often prevailed in her councils, we want no further argument to prove her divinity; for if she had not been divine and upheld by the hand of God, she would have ceased to exist ages ago. Courage and fidelity in declaring the whole counsel of God is the highest prudence, and those great pontiffs who took counsel of God alone, and proved themselves superior to human weakness and timidity, as St. Gregory VII., Innocent III., St. Gregory IX., St. Pius V., and Sixtus Quintus, have always been, so far as man may judge, the most successful in their pontificates, and have done the most to advance the interests and disarm the enemies of the church.

And we venture to place in the same rank with these great pontificates, that of our present Holy Father Pius IX. None of those great pontiffs performed a greater feat than he has done through the Council of the Vatican, in driving so-called liberal Catholics from the church, of which they were the most dangerous enemies, whether intentionally or not, stripping liberal and compromising Catholics, who say in the same breath "Good Lord" and "Good Devil," of all their Catholic pretensions, and compelling them to take their side, either to be firm and stanch adherents of the Holy See and upholders of the papal supremacy and infallibility, or to cease to call themselves Catholics. It is a great thing, this sifting of the Catholic body, purging it of its really heretical elements, and rendering it a solid and compact

body, holding really one faith, and animated and directed by one and the same spirit. We may regret that such men as Döllinger, Père Hyacinthe, and their adherents, have refused to hear the church, but solely for their own sake. So far as the interests of the Catholic body are in question, their exclusion is a great gain. Their influence in the church or over Catholics is gone, and can never be revived. The doctrine of the sovereigns is not any longer a *sententia in ecclesia*, as it never was a *sententia ecclesiæ*. It is now anathematized, and kings, princes, and emperors must henceforth understand that, while the church claims no authority *in* their principality, they hold it as a sacred trust from God, and are bound to administer it according to the prescriptions of the law of God, of which the vicar of Christ is the guardian and supreme judge. They can no longer deny this and claim to be Catholics. That political atheists, like the *Alt-Katholiken*, should protest against this, and that Cæsar should resent the assertion of Peter as his superior, or the spiritual as above and over the secular, and use all his power to destroy the church, and annihilate the papacy, need neither surprise nor alarm us. But, however fierce the struggle, it must end, for no violence lasts for ever, and when ended it can never be renewed, at least, not on the same ground; and the church will have won her greatest victory, and crushed the head of the serpent that has so often bruised her heel.

These considerations are amply sufficient, in our judgment, to defend, if any defence were needed, the council on the score of prudence against the objections of the inopportunists. The result already proves it. Never have we seen the Catholic body more united, or a closer union between the head and the members; never, not even in the martyr ages, have we seen Catholics animated by a more dauntless courage, a more vigorous faith, a more burning charity. If their numbers have been somewhat diminished, we hear our Lord say to them, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your heavenly Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

We, perhaps, have dwelt at quite an unnecessary length on the position assumed by the inopportunists. We certainly do not in the slightest degree impugn their orthodoxy or the purity of their motives; but as they were overruled by an overwhelming majority, and by the official action of the council, we hope we may say without offence, that we think they erred in judgment, and took counsel of their

fears rather than of their faith. But we own that we have availed ourselves of the opportunity to enter an old man's protest against what seems to us an excess of prudence, and what looks to us like a lack of confidence in truth, only another name for lack of confidence in God, which meets us in almost every page of ecclesiastical history. Men in authority, feeling the great responsibility resting on them, are strongly tempted to adopt the maxim, *Quieta non movere*, even when things are not *quiet*, and errors are creeping in and gaining a ground from which it will be difficult to expel them. The inquisition we are told, owed its origin to the fact, that bishops failed to discharge the proper duties of their office in watching over the faith of their flocks, in ferreting out errors and heresies creeping in among them, and in taking prompt and efficient measures to suppress them. Pope Honorius was condemned by a general council, after his death, not for having erred in his faith—for even Bishop Hefele concedes that he was orthodox—but for his culpable negligence in refusing to exercise his pontifical authority to crush the monothelite heresy in its incipiency; and the terrible consequences of his negligence still afflict the East.

If we do not think the inopportunists had good reasons for opposing the definition of papal infallibility while they believed it to be a revealed truth, we are happy to be informed that not one of them has stood out against the definition, and therefore, even on the lowest Gallican ground, the papal infallibility ceases to be henceforth an open question. The question is *res adjudicata*, and cannot be reopened. Whoever would be a Catholic must accept it *ex animo*, and whoever denies it must be to us as a heathen or a publican. But it is important that there should be no misunderstanding as to what is really meant by papal infallibility. Here we avail ourselves of the clear and lucid explanations of the sermon before us:—

"Now, dearly beloved Christians, I must come at once to the great feature of the council, that is, to the definition of the infallible teaching (*magisterium*) of the Roman pontiff. Much has been said and written upon it, even by the secular press. Some things, thus said and written, are true, others are false; hence many wrong impressions have been made in men's minds. It is therefore my intention to give to you a true and exact meaning of the definition of this dogma of our faith, and also the grounds upon which it is founded.

"Among the many wrong impressions made in men's minds on the

occasion of this definition, is that we have raised the Roman pontiff to attributes never known before, and attributes which are incompatible with the nature of men. They say that we have raised the pope to the level and dignity of God himself; some even confound infallibility with impeccability, and say that we make the pope impeccable. Now, to all these wrong impressions, and to others of the same nature, I say that we make a perfect distinction between the Sovereign Pontiff as man in his personal and individual capacity, and in his office and dignity as the supreme head of the church. In the former aspect, the pope is like other men, subject by his human nature to all the miseries and frailties of our corrupted nature; therefore the popes, as men, may err and sin as other men; and some unfortunately have sinned.

"Yet, in justice to the papacy, it must be said that never was there a body of men invested with power and authority, who showed more of the spirit of God, and less of the weakness of human nature; who acquitted themselves of the responsibilities of their position with more justice, honor, and dignity, than the long list of two hundred and fifty-eight pontiffs who sat on, and adorned by their virtues, the Chair of Peter. The history of their lives, of their public and official acts, is open to all. Let it be read, and sifted, and studied, the closer the better; for no impartial critic can rise from such a task without performing for almost all of them, the same service which Roscoe rendered to Leo X.; that of imparting a brighter lustre to the halo which already encircles their names.

"The attribute of infallibility with which the sovereign pontiff is invested, is in consideration of his office as the supreme head of the church, and as the universal teacher of God's church on earth. No people ought to be more apt to understand this distinction between man and his office than we American people, on account of our republican form of government. Here is a man individually without power; as a citizen not different from any other citizen; but he is raised into office by a popular vote, and then he is invested with the most extraordinary powers, according to the nature of his office. Here is a mere citizen who has been raised to the office of judge, say to the office of chief justice of the supreme court. That individual, as a man, has no more power than any other man. Who cares for what he says or does as a mere individual? His words, his opinions, his judgments, are of no more account than those of any other man; but let that man be raised to the office of chief justice of the supreme court, exercise the functions of his office, take his seat on the judicial bench to preside at the trial of a case;—ah, how different are his words, his opinions, and his judgments from those of other men. He speaks as a judge; he pronounces his judgment upon a case; his words are all-powerful; all must submit to his decision, from which there is no appeal.

"We find a beautiful illustration of this in the divinely written word of God. Our Lord prayed for Peter that his faith may not fail. Peter

shortly after denied Christ, but he denied him as a man acting in the capacity of a poor, weak, frail mortal; whereas the privilege of not falling into error, of holding firm to the faith, was granted to him by reason of his office, as the supreme head of the church, and the rock upon which it was built.

"I must come now to defeat another wrong impression in connection with this doctrine of infallibility. Some say, Where is now the boast that the Catholic Church never changes? That the Catholic Church is not like the modern sects that are constantly changing? What has become now of those assertions, that new doctrines cannot be added to the Catholic faith? Has not a new doctrine, a new article of faith been added? Formerly it was not a Catholic doctrine that the pope was infallible, and now it is. To all these objections I answer, that truly no new doctrine can be made, and this is asserted in the constitution of the Vatican Council defining the infallible teaching of the Roman pontiff. That by virtue of this privilege of infallibility, the Roman pontiff does not and cannot teach a new doctrine.

"But I emphatically deny that this doctrine of the pope's infallibility is a new doctrine. It is a new definition of a doctrine already believed by the church, but not a definition of a new doctrine. The two things are quite different. Here is a case which comes exactly to the point. The Council of Nice made a new definition, and even a new creed, called the Nicene Creed, by which it defined the divinity of Christ against the errors of Arius. Now, does it follow from this, that, because the Catholic Church in the Council of Nice defined the divinity of Christ, the divinity of Christ was not believed previous to the Council of Nice? Can this be, that the corner truth of Christianity was not believed during the three first centuries of the church? In these three first centuries, which were the ages of martyrs, the divinity of Christ was not believed? Or if it were believed, as surely it was, then it does not follow, that, because a truth or doctrine is defined, that truth or doctrine was not believed previous to that definition. On the contrary, the definition of a doctrine is the strongest guaranty that the doctrine was always believed, or else it could not be defined; and again does it follow that, because the Council of Nice made the new definition of the divinity of Christ, that the church changed? So let us apply the same principle to our present case. By this new definition of the infallibility of the pope, a new doctrine has not been added to the Catholic faith, and that the church has not changed by this new definition."

Yet so grave a journal as the *New York Observer*, the oldest religious journal published in the United States, has the simplicity or the audacity to assert that the council declared and Catholics hold the pope to be God, or at least to be clothed with divine and incommunicable attributes! The learned bishop, whose mother-tongue was not English,

perhaps is verbally inexact, when he speaks of the *attribute* of infallibility with which the sovereign pontiff is invested, for *attribute* usually expresses in English the quality of the man, not of the office, precisely what the bishop intended to deny. The papal infallibility is the privilege of the office, not the attribute of the man, and is official, not personal: at least, this is all the author intended to assert, and is all the council has defined. The *Observer's* assertion is therefore either very silly or very malicious. The Catholic holds the pope to be infallible only in his official character as supreme teacher of the universal church, in matters of faith or matters pertaining to faith, and directly or indirectly affecting it. The pope is supreme governor and supreme teacher of the universal church, but it is only in the latter character that the council defines him to have the privilege of inerrancy. In governing we own his authority, but we are not required to believe him infallible.

But this privilege, which attaches not to the person but to the office, is by virtue of no natural power or attribute of the pope, and does not necessarily imply any superior natural ability or attainments in wisdom or sanctity on his part, but is, solely by virtue of the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, promised to him in his office of teacher, and who, as the Spirit of Truth, leads him into all truth. To pretend that to maintain this is to make the pope God, or to clothe him personally with divine attributes, is very absurd, especially in the *Observer*, which professes to believe in the infallibility of the written word, communicated through men chosen for that purpose. The infallibility attaches, strictly speaking, to the Holy Ghost, not to the human organ, and the only question that can be raised is, Is the Holy Ghost able to make a man the organ of his infallibility? The *Observer* cannot deny it, for it holds that the sacred writers were all inspired by the Holy Ghost who used them as his organs not only to teach truth, already revealed and preserved by tradition, but even to reveal truth before unknown to men, and both to reveal and to teach truth infallibly: which is somewhat more than we claim for the papacy. Which, indeed, is the greater, to inspire prophets and apostles to *reveal* the truth infallibly, or to assist the pope to teach, define, and declare the truth already revealed by prophets, apostles, and our Lord himself, and deposited with the church? The *Observer* professes to believe the greater, but shrinks from the less. God, according

to this Evangelical sheet, can very well use men as his organs in revealing, but not in preserving, the truth in the minds of the faithful? Nay, we are wrong. The *Observer* is Evangelical; and Evangelicals claim, through the assistance of the internal illuminations of the Holy Ghost, creating what some of them call "the Christian consciousness," for each and every truly regenerate soul, all the infallibility that Catholics claim for the sovereign pontiff. According to the doctrine of the *Observer*, every regenerate soul, then, is God, or clothed with the incommunicable attributes of the divinity. A great institution is the *New York Observer!*

The pope is infallible in teaching, defining the revealed truth or the *depositum;* but this carries with it, necessarily, infallibility in teaching and defining the principles on which the revealed truth is founded, and in condemning all errors opposed to them. As these principles are like all real principles catholic, the same in all orders, since the several orders, generation, regeneration, and glorification, are only parts of a complete and dialectic whole,* the papal infallibility must extend to the principles of all the sciences no less than to dogma. The pope is infallible in judging the theories and speculations of philosophers, moralists, the hypotheses and inductions of the scientists, the schemes of politicians, and the projects of social reformers, for to judge these pertains to his office of supreme doctor of the universal church, and because error in any of these impugns the catholic principles which underlie Christian faith and morals.

The pope is also supreme governor, with plenary authority as the vicar of Christ to direct and govern the universal church. But in so far as this government is a question of prudence, no Catholic holds the pope to be infallible. He may make mistakes, for he may be misinformed as to facts, and he may be deceived as to men and the agents he employs, or the pastors he appoints. He may also be weak, deficient in zeal, energy, and vigilance, and thus fail in the prompt and faithful discharge of the duties of his office. But his infallibility in faith and morals saves him in his government from usurping any powers not included in his divine commission, and from enjoining or commanding any thing to be done that in principle contradicts the law

* See *Synthetic Theology*, Vol III., pp. 536 *et seq.*

of God. The pope may not always choose the wisest and best measures to remedy evils which creep in or are produced by the changes ever going on in the world in the midst of which the church is placed; he may be too slow to exert his authority, to strike with the sword of Peter, too yielding to the secular powers, and too afraid of provoking their wrath, in a word, over-prudent, or over-cautious; yet it would be difficult to prove that any pope has ever really erred in this respect, or that, all the circumstances considered, the papal administration has not been in all cases the wisest and best practicable at the time and place. As we read ecclesiastical history, we encounter several popes who seem to us to have as governors made grave mistakes alike in civil and in ecclesiastical affairs; but this judgment of ours is not infallible, and except where we have the authority of a subsequent pope, as in some instances we have, we do not like to assert that a pope has actually blundered even in his administration. We know not all the circumstances of the case, nor the secret designs of Providence; and the safe rule to follow is, that the presumption, in legal phrase, is always in favor of legitimate authority. All we mean to assert is, that, while we are held to strict obedience to the disciplinary and administrative authority of the pope as supreme governor of the universal church, we are obliged to assert his infallibility only when he is exercising his office of supreme doctor of the whole church.

The bishop of Pittsburgh gives the principal grounds of our faith in the papal infallibility, but we cannot at present follow him in that question. It suffices to say here, that if the pope is appointed by our Lord, to whom is given of his Father all power in heaven and in earth, to be the supreme teacher of the universal church, the universal church is commanded by God himself to believe and hold fast what the pope teaches. If then the pope could err in his teaching, the whole church by the divine authority might be led into error. This would suppose that God who is truth, truth in itself, could be the accomplice of error and falsehood; which is both absurd and blasphemous. God can no more sanction the teaching of error than he can lie, and for God to lie is impossible.

THE CHURCH ABOVE THE STATE.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for July, 1873.]

We have seldom read a pastoral with more satisfaction than this of the right reverend bishop of Cleveland for last Lent. It is brief, but it is bold and energetic, straightforward and earnest. The venerable prelate evidently knows what he means, and he says it without circumlocution or reticence. A portion of it is of a local character, but a large part of it, though intended for and adapted to his own diocese, is applicable to every other diocese in the country. We cannot deny ourselves the honor of making an extract of some length:—

"Though much has been done, much remains to be done: enemies are everywhere. Resistance to law is the order of the day; revolution is triumphant; and under the guise of progress, infidelity and disobedience is the religion of the hour. Liberty, which now means license, disorder, robbery, is in every one's mouth, whilst God and truth are forgotten. The Holy Father is a prisoner, the church persecuted and robbed, and her authority defied. Society is fast accepting the old pagan doctrine, that the individual is for the state, not the state for the individual. Under the specious plea of zeal for education, unless we make a bold stand for our rights, we shall soon see the child taken from the parent, and compulsory education inaugurated. Few believe and fewer still care for religion. The church cries aloud her warning note, but nobody listens; whilst the devil goes on sowing the seeds of ruin. We must be up and doing, and, shoulder to shoulder, meet the enemy. Never was there a time when Catholics needed unity more, or when they had a more dangerous enemy to meet; dangerous, because he comes as an angel of light.

"If we will hold our own amid this universal war that is going on, we must be more united. There must be less petty jealousies amongst us, nationalities must be made subordinate to religion, and we must learn that we are Catholics first, and citizens next. *Catholicity does not bring us in conflict with the state, yet it teaches that God is above man, and the church above the state.* To the church as the representative of God, we owe a spiritual allegiance, yet, in all that does not conflict with the law of God, we owe an unqualified obedience to the state.

"The question of the day is no longer Catholicity and Protestantism;

**Lenten Pastoral of the Rt. Rev. Richard Gilmour, Bishop of Cleveland, on Christian Education and other Catholic Duties.* 1873.

but Catholicity and nationalism or infidelity, which, under the cry of education, carries on the war. Educate the man and you make him good, say modern reformers. True ; but the word educate, has two meanings. In man there are two powers to direct; the mind and the heart. Forgetting that if you educate the head and forget the heart, you have but half performed your task, and that, without religion, man cannot be moral. The modern would-be educators give indeed men intellectual power, but leave them without the moral training necessary to use it. Smartness to them is every thing ; goodness nothing. When you have developed the intellectual powers, you have put into the hands of man a dangerous weapon, much like a locomotive on a railroad. The machinery is powerful, the boiler is strong, and the steam at the proper gauge, and men exclaim, what power! This is what the education of the intellect gives—power; power for evil, power for good; power to destroy, as well as to save. Like the locomotive that genius has created, education gives power, but cannot give skill to guide, any more than genius that may create, can, without experience, guide the power it has created. Who would trust himself aboard a railroad car without a skilled hand to guide the power that is to draw it? yet, to guide the human mind, the most powerful and intricate of all machines, men insist that skill is not needed, and that this machine can be run without a guide.

"Now what is this guide? Religion, says the Catholic Church; religion, says experience; and religion, begin to say the wiser men of the age. The Greeks and Romans were highly educated, but they were not moral: what of morality they had, came from their religion. Pagan though they were, they made religion part of their education; and the better to impress the laws of their gods upon the citizen, they united priest and emperor in the Cæsar.

"At present we have nothing to hope from the state. Yet we must not therefore cease to insist upon our rights, and, if needs be, at the polls demand them. Were Catholics alive and united on the school question; were they to demand from every man who asks their vote, a pledge that he would vote for our just share of the school fund, legislators would learn to respect the Catholic vote, and give us our just rights. Catholics are too timid; they seem to go upon the principle that if they are tolerated, they are doing well. This is a mistake; if we let our rights go by default, we should not wonder if we lose them. We must be decided in our demands, and present a bolder front to our enemies. It is unjust so to organize the public schools that we cannot in conscience send our children to them, and then tax us for their support. As well create a state church, and tax us for its support."

There is nothing novel or in itself startling in the assertion that "God is above man and the church above the state," but it requires some courage on the part of a Catholic bishop

in these times to proclaim it; for it is precisely what the age denies, and what exposes the church just now to a bitter persecution throughout Europe, and excites no little hostility to her even in our own boasted land of equal rights and religious liberty. The great controversy of the day turns on this very point. Gallicans, Old Catholics, liberal Catholics, Protestants, Jews, infidels, all unite in more or less distinctly declaring, at least by implication, that in the government of this world God is not above man, nor the church above the state. All those Catholics, and we meet them everywhere, who are accustomed to say, "My religion has nothing to do with my politics; I respect the priest in his place, but if he comes out of it, I treat him as I would any other man," and who, of course, claim for themselves the right to define what is the priest's place and to keep him in it, practically deny it, as do also all those Catholics who form secret societies, associations, and combinations, for national objects, based on principles that contradict the principles of their faith as Christians, or seek to accomplish them, by means religion forbids. All these, though they may not be aware of it, place a pretended patriotism above the Christian law, the state above the church, and therefore man above God.

All Protestants place the state above the church, for it is of the essence of Protestantism to subordinate the church to the state, or national authority,—to subject the divine to the human, that is, God to man. It was for this the so-called reformation was made, and the Protestant movement is cherished solely as a movement in behalf of what its adherents call the liberty of mankind. That is, simply and honestly stated, because it tends to liberate man from the authority of God and the pope his representative, or vicar on earth, and to make the human supreme, as expressed by the phrase, private judgment. Protestants, if in words they assert that God is above man, in reality and intention exclude him from all authority in the government, as we have said, of this world. They reject the church, his representative or his kingdom on the earth, and deny all access to him in order to hear his oracles, or to receive his commands. Infidels are on this question like Protestants, only a little more open, frank, and less hypocritical and evasive. This is one side in the controversy of the age, and the side opposed to the side taken by the bishop of Cleveland, and by all his brother bishops, to the side taken by the pope their chief, and therefore to the side of God, the universal and sovereign Lord.

Does any one doubt the nature of the controversy? Let him read, then, the following article from the *National Zeitung* of Berlin, in which Prince von Bismarck outlined his recent speech in the Prussian house of lords, against the independence of the church. We have the speech itself before us, but this abstract is equally authentic, and more outspoken, and less diplomatic :—

"If curse and ban possessed an immediate magical agency—if the conjuror of the Vatican could let fly the little stone that would smash the Colossus—the oppressed church would change itself into a triumphal one, and that in the proximate future. Never have more objurgations fallen from the lips of any pope than from those of Pius IX. There is no state with which he has not fallen out. He has solemnly cursed the fundamental laws of Germany, of Austria, of Italy; he has commenced open war with Switzerland; he conspires against the constitution at present obtaining in France; his anathema has fallen upon Spanish arrangements; several years have elapsed since he expelled the Russian envoy with violence from his court: such matters, even in papal history, are not by way of being rarities—at least during the last three centuries. The understanding must accommodate itself to many incomprehensible things; but hitherto, when the church's need has risen to its maximum point through the vagaries of a pope, help has always been hard at hand. The savior death has appeared and has bundled off the old conjuror; and, inspired by the Holy Ghost, the conclave has raised to the seat of the apostle-prince a man of diametrically opposite principles. * * * Do not those words exactly fit the present condition of the world? Not the temporality, but the church itself is fallen, through syllabus and dogma of infallibility, into a far worse and more dangerous position than under the pontificate of the thirteenth Clement. It was, considering the psychic temper (*Geistesstimmung*) of the age, the most fatal of all the Roman stupidities to insist upon the proclamation of these theories. It was a matter of absolute indifference what the church thought about them; we, who do not belong to her, were insulted by the impertinence with which an old and, according to our notions, ignorant man dared publicly and solemnly, in the paragraphs of his syllabus, to curse that which we esteemed holy, and to assume to himself, in the paragraphs of his fantastical dogma, a lordship over us. Wordiness, culture, the state itself, were challenged with an intrepidity only equalled by the blindness of the ringleader; not we evoked the calamity. When the opponents of infallibility, those eighty-four men who had in all preliminary meetings declared themselves against the proclamation of the dogma, quitted Rome before the decisive vote of the council, abandoning their flag in the most cowardly manner, the bark of Christ sprang an irreparable leak, and it was plainly manifest that those who sat in it were no martyrs, but hirelings; then society, half incredulous, saw with astonishment and horror

that in the general council of Catholic Christendom there was not one conscientious man to stand up and say, 'Here I stand; I can do no other; God help me further. Amen!' This fact condemned the Catholic hierarchy. The infallible Pope Pius IX. was, in 1849, the ideal of the Italian liberals whom to-day he curses. The transformation which the world then hoped for at the hands of the Roman Catholic Church, already cast widely before it its majestic shadow. Wherefore secede from a church which intends to make its peace with modern culture and society? so said quiet, thoughtful people—and remained. The syllabus, the 'non possumus,' and the infallibility dogma were necessary to prove that between modern society and Rome nothing real or durable can exist except war. Roman Catholicism is being surely driven to take up that position which, 1,500 years ago, perishing heathendom occupied with regard to ambitious Christendom. It is the religion of the uneducated. * * * So long as Rome could dispose of the secular arm in her service, and the night of ignorance beshrouded the world, her mastery was easy. No intelligence was required to burn dissidents. The conflict in which we are now engaging in Germany derives the desperation of its character only from the fact that the state has too long favored and furthered the aggressions of the church. * * * The liberals overestimate the strength of their adversary. In the end this battle must become a battle of intelligence; and upon that territory the Jesuits, ghostly as well as worldly, with all their dogmas and the miracles of the saints to boot, cannot but quickly come to grief."

This, though only an abstract, is clear and distinct enough as to the animus and views of the German chancellor, and the pretensions of the secular party. The blasphemies against the vicar of Christ sufficiently prove that it is written on the assumption that the state is above the church, and that Prince von Bismarck, who has merited the title of "prince of this world," evidently adopts as his fixed policy, that of suffering no authority, not even spiritual, to subsist in Germany not subject to the state or the national will. Grant that the pope has broken, or has difficulties, with all the governments the *National Zeitung* names, whose is the fault? In the first place, let it be understood that the pope does not deal in curses, and has not as yet placed a single kingdom, empire, state, or nation under the ban of the church, not even the so-called kingdom of Italy, nor excommunicated, *eo nomine*, a single prince or ruler. In the second place, the difficulties that exist between the pope and the several secular governments have been caused by their acts, not by his. In every instance they have been the aggressors, and he has acted only on the defensive, in defence of the divine rights of the church, and rights ac-

knowledged and guarantied to her by these governments in the concordats agreed on between them and the pope, her supreme chief. The pope has done nothing that he has not the right to do, even by the acknowledgment of the state itself, if it holds itself bound by the concordats to which it has assented and pledged its faith; nor which it was not his duty to do as chief of the church, or kingdom of God on earth, if the spiritual power is, by its own nature, above the secular. Because the pope protests against the breach of faith on the part of the secular governments, they have no right to lay the blame on him, and accuse him of their own perfidiousness, or of breaking the peace, which they themselves by their own perfidy have broken. Yet this is precisely what the article does, and what the secular power in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain, persists in doing.

We honor the noble bishop of Cleveland for his bold and unequivocal assertion of the Catholic principle, the basis of all right, of all ethics, of all law, of all liberty, and of all civilization, and the condemnation of all tyranny, despotism, barbarism, that God is above man, and the church above the state. Not many years ago the *Review* incurred great odium, in high Catholic quarters, for asserting and defending, in its war against political atheism, the same principle and its necessary corollaries. From our entrance into the Catholic Church, or at least very soon after, we saw, as clearly as it is now seen, that the great enemy which we had as a Catholic reviewer to fight, was political atheism, or statolatry, as some of our French friends called it. We found bishops and priests, who believed the pope, *loquens ex cathedra*, to be infallible in faith and morals, and yet made no bones of swallowing the first three of the four Gallican articles. Since Bossuet and Louis Quatorze, or rather the minister Colbert, the Prince von Bismarck of France in the seventeenth century, there has been down to our day, great caution and hesitancy in asserting the papal power, or in asserting the supremacy of the church as the kingdom of God on earth, the kingdom of Him who has engraven on his thigh, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS. It has been forgotten, or judged imprudent to assert, that the church was founded expressly for maintaining the divine government on earth for all men and nations. It seemed to the wise and prudent hardly safe to assert the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal, and therefore of Peter over Cæsar.

The result in this case, as in that of papal infallibility, has been to confirm us in the conclusion, that the faithful at least should be taught their religion in its full strength, and that, just in proportion as we withhold or slur over the points supposed to be the most offensive to the secular powers, do we weaken the faithful, and prepare the world to gain terrible victories over them. There is no gainsaying the fact that for two centuries the majority of Catholics have been prepared, neither by instruction in the principles of their faith, nor by the public opinion of Catholic nations, to meet, without a fearful loss, such a conflict as the present between the two powers, or between the church and the world. It is useless to look back; but this lesson we think is forced upon us for the future, that the highest prudence is courage and unwavering confidence in truth, or courage in teaching the faithful the full supremacy of the church, as it was asserted by the Gregorys, the Innocents, the Bonifaces, and other great mediæval popes. We do not say that, in the altered state of the world, the pope should attempt to exercise in the same way the same spiritual authority over professedly Catholic sovereigns that these great and glorious pontiffs exercised; but we do contend that the faithful should understand that the power they claimed and exercised is inherent in the sovereign pontiff, who is judge of the time, manner, and conditions of its exercise. The power has not lapsed.

We are claiming here no temporal power for the pope, and never have claimed any temporal power for him out of his own temporal principality, of which he has been despoiled. The power we claim for him is not the power which he formerly held as feudal suzerain of various European states, nor the power he sometimes exercised as the chosen or recognized arbitrator in disputes between sovereigns, or between sovereigns and their subjects, though a wiser or more impartial arbitrator could not be selected; but a purely spiritual power, which he holds as vicar of Jesus Christ, or divinely appointed and assisted head of the kingdom of God on earth. We recognize the distinction of the two orders, spiritual and temporal, but not as two coördinate and mutually independent powers. The state has no superior in its own order, but its own order is inferior and subordinate to the spiritual order, that is, to the church, or kingdom of God on earth. The state is subject to the law of God; and so long as it obeys that law, as

declared and applied by the infallible chief of the spiritual power, the church does not interfere with it, or censure its enactments or administration. The pope speaks only when that law is violated and the rights of God are usurped, and he speaks then, not by reason of the temporality, but by reason of the spirituality, and judges "not the fief, but the sin." At least, so says the great pontiff Innocent III., in his letter to Philip Augustus. Sin in all cases comes within the jurisdiction of the spiritual authority, and all enactments or acts of a sovereign prince or state, forbidden by the law of God, are sins, and therefore, as such, are cognizable by the pope. It is only for such acts, that is, sins against God, that the pope admonishes a sovereign, and, if need be, punishes him.

That the pope has, as vicar of Christ, what is called the deposing power, we hold to be indubitable; but the conditions of its exercise hardly exist in the present state of the world; and we do not see how the pope could exercise it, were he, as he is not, disposed to revive it. He could not exercise it in a country like ours, for there is in such a country no one to depose. He might, indeed, lay the republic under an interdict, but that would only punish Catholics; non-Catholics would not heed it, or suffer any deprivation in consequence. The power can have practical effect only in a Catholic nation, where the prince professes, and is bound to profess and maintain, the Catholic religion to which the civil law is held to conform. For the pope to depose the heretical or infidel sovereign of an heretical or an infidel nation, deprive him of his dignity, and absolve his subjects from their allegiance, would avail nothing. Neither the sovereign nor his subjects would heed the papal deposition. The power can be exercised only in Catholic nations whose governments are Catholic and form constituent parts of Christendom; and, strictly speaking, there is no longer a Christendom, and there are now no Catholic states or governments. The pope deposed Elizabeth, the bastard daughter of Henry VIII., and absolved her subjects from their allegiance, because she was a member of the Catholic Church and had been crowned as a Catholic sovereign; but the English Catholics were more *English* than Catholic, and chose to fight for the queen who deprived them of every one of their rights and sent them to Tyburn to be hung, drawn, and quartered for their religion, rather than to join the pope in recovering their own freedom and that of their

religion. Yet the pope never absolves Catholics in heretical or infidel nations, under heretical or infidel princes, from their allegiance, for he never absolved them from their allegiance to the pagan Cæsars; he simply commands them not to do any thing the law of God forbids, and to submit without a murmur to the injustice they are obliged to suffer in consequence, and to look for their reward to their heavenly Father. No, you must bring back a state of things similar to that which existed in the middle ages, or the power in question must lie in abeyance.

The bishop of Cleveland calls upon the Catholics of his diocese to be united and to insist on their rights at the polls, and, as far as in their power, to defend them by their votes. Nothing is more just than that Catholics should do so, or than that they should refuse to vote for any man who will not pledge himself to use all his influence, if elected, against the law, for instance, which taxes Catholics for the support of schools which their church condemns, and to which they cannot, without violating their conscience, send their children. The state might as well tax them for the support of a religion they abhor. Such a law denies the freedom of religion, violates the equal rights of citizens before the state, and is manifestly unjust and unconstitutional. But whether we can do any thing to redress the wrong by our votes, is another question. Catholics outnumber any one of the sects in the Union, but they are a feeble minority as against all combined. If we enter as a Catholic party into the elections, we can effect any thing only where parties are so equally divided that we hold the balance between them, and it becomes an object of importance with each to secure our votes. Such a state of parties exists at present in no state in the Union; and if it did, on political questions, the two leading parties would unite to oppose and defeat Catholics on the school question. The right reverend bishop will permit us to doubt the efficacy, at present, of the policy he recommends. The old party, founded by Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, and which had some respect for equal rights and religious liberty, although it had not much religion, is virtually defunct; and we know no party at present in the country that has in its principles or its measures the slightest regard for equal rights, or the faintest conception of what liberty in any proper sense of the word really means. It is useless to shut our eyes to this fact. We count for less in elections than we did a dozen years ago, when our numbers were fewer.

The party now in power represents fairly enough the dominant tone and sentiment of the country, and is a decidedly anti-Catholic party. It is ruled by General Grant; and General Grant, without a spark of religion, and eaten up by nepotism, is ruled chiefly by the Methodists, the most unprincipled, unscrupulous, and bitterly anti-Catholic sect to which Protestantism has ever given birth. All the Evangelical sects, so called, are allied with it, and, so far as Catholics and Catholic rights are concerned, form with it but one body. The only sect in the country that to some extent stand aloof from the alliance are the Baptists, who have not absolutely forgotten the religious liberty they asserted when they were persecuted by the "Standing Order," or Congregationalists of New England. With all deference, then, we must say that we do not see any chance to obtain, through any possible political action, the rights guarantied to us in nearly every state in the Union. We are in fact politically null, and cannot help ourselves. It is enough to know that we, as Catholics, oppose a measure or policy, to fasten it on the country. Protestants will even make large sacrifices of their own possessions, out of hatred to Catholics and fear of the pope. Even Catholics, if elected to office, are less able to serve our interests than are fair-minded Protestants, for they are pretty sure, in the first place, to be *liberal* Catholics who place their politics before their religion; and, in the second place, if not, they are afraid, as well as unable, to defend boldly and energetically Catholic rights, because they do not represent Catholic constituencies, have been elected, not for their Catholicity, but in spite of it, and have an overwhelming and unsympathizing majority against them. We may be too faint-hearted, but we confess that we see little for us to do but to insist on our rights in the most energetic terms we can use, to study to keep our religion, as far as possible, out of the political arena, and to be careful to provoke no political contests in which parties will divide as Catholics and Protestants,—submit to the wrongs we are unable to redress, and wait patiently till, in God's own time, the people turn once more to the church, and beg and implore her to save them from themselves, from the anarchy and despotism to which in their blind folly they are hastening.

But, however this may be, there can be no question that, as the bishop says, the war raging is between the church and political atheism. We asserted and endeavored to show

it in the revolutionary epoch of 1848, and even at an earlier date; but we could make but a very few of our Catholic friends see it, and found still fewer of them willing to accept the line on which we proposed to fight out the battle. We saw then and we see now no ground on which we could or can successfully combat political atheism, but that of the supremacy of the spiritual order, and of the pope as its divinely constituted representative, or vicar of Christ, in the government of human affairs. So we assured those of our Catholic brethren who disapproved our course as imprudent, as too bold and hazardous, and as going too far. The opposition was too strong for us, layman as we were, to insist, and we withdrew from the fight. But we retained our conviction, and the syllabus and the definitions of the Council of the Vatican have only served to confirm it, and to give us the right and the courage to renew the fight on the line which our friends, not our enemies, induced us to suspend. Yet if we were right in the position we took up, the credit is due not to us, to our learning, ability, wisdom, or sagacity, but to the late bishop of Boston, of immortal memory, who was our instructor; and to the learned, able, and energetic priests who surrounded him, and who took unwearied pains to instruct us in the principles as well as the specific dogmas of the Catholic faith.

The germ of political atheism was already concealed in the four articles of the Gallican clergy,—especially in the denial that the power of the keys extends to kings, save as simply private individuals. For this withdrew their crowns, their official conduct, and therefore, in principle, the whole civil authority, the state and all its acts, from the supervision and authority of the spiritual order, and therefore from the sovereignty of God; which is precisely what we understand by political atheism. The Gallican theory, always the theory of courts and courtiers, and in recent times of the larger portion of the lay community, whether professedly Catholic or non-Catholic, is based on the assumption of an original dualism, that the natural law and the revealed law are two distinct, coördinate, and mutually independent laws, founding two distinct and mutually independent orders. It assumes that the state holds from the natural law, and is supreme in the natural order, therefore in all questions touching natural society and natural morality; and that the church holds from the revealed law, and is supreme only in matters appertaining to the revealed order, or the mysteries

and dogmas of faith, and the sacraments and their administration. But as that which is natural is prior to that which is spiritual, the state is prior to the church, it defines for itself and for her the extent and limits of each, and therefore determines the sphere of the church's free and independent action—and, in practice, restricts her sphere to another world and forbids her to meddle with the affairs of this world, as we see in the acts of Cavour and his successors in the Italian government. The law of nature being understood to be independent of the revealed law, it required very little refinement to assert, first in practice and then in theory, that the state, holding under it, is independent of the spiritual order, then not subject to the dominion of Christ, and therefore not subject to the dominion of God: which is downright political atheism.

Concede the Gallican dualism, as we were required to do, and we know no method by which political atheism can be logically refuted. But the assumption of that dualism is the virtual denial of Christianity, not less so than the assumption of the Magian and Manichean dualism, revived in Calvinism, which makes evil positive, and therefore must assign it a positive principle opposed to the principle of good. The natural law and the revealed are distinguished, we grant, yet not as two separate and mutually independent laws, but as two parts or sections of one and the same divine law; and hence we find in the syllabus, as already intimated, that the total separation of church and state, and their mutual independence as coördinate powers, is condemned, and can be held by no Catholic. The natural law, as far as it goes, is as strictly and as truly the law of God as is the revealed law, which if called the new law, it is only in relation to the Mosaic law, but is really older than that law, as St. Paul to the Galatians assures us, for it was the law from the beginning, in reference to which man was originally created. The natural law is called *natural*, not because enjoined by nature and not immediately by God himself, for nature being creature and dependent cannot legislate, except by a figure of speech; but because it includes those prescriptions of the universal law of God which are cognizable by natural reason. The works of God form a dialectic whole, and the natural law or the moral law is only the initial section of the one divine law, which finds its fulfilment in regeneration and glorification, as we showed in our article on *Synthetic Theology*.* We shall not find this

*Vol. III., pp. 536 *et seq.*

grand principle brought out in our text-books of moral philosophy, for they treat only of the rational order, and for the most part treat of it as if it were an independent order without any dialectic relation to the revealed and palingenesiac orders, or the ultimate end of man. It is only in the theologians, who treat philosophy and theology in their ultimate principles and mutual relation as forming in the mind and creative act of God one uniform and dialectic whole, that we find it set forth, and are enabled to apprehend something of the grandeur, the majesty, the glory, and the sublime logic of creation and the Creator's design.

The natural law and the revealed law are not two laws, but two parts of one and the same divine law, the one law of the one kingdom of God, and law alike for the temporal and the spiritual, for kings and subjects, states and individuals, and in every sphere and department of life. This one law, whether in the rational order or the supra-rational, as we understand Catholic teaching, is deposited by our Lord with his church, of which the successor of Peter in the see of Rome is the supreme visible head, commissioned by him and assisted by the Holy Ghost to be its guardian, keeper, interpreter, and supreme judge for all men and nations in all their relations. This is so, or Catholicity is false and without meaning; and Catholicity cannot be false or without meaning, unless downright atheism be true, and the fool says truly in his heart, "God is not." This gives the death-blow to political atheism, the independence of the political order, or its freedom from subjection to the spiritual order, represented by the pope as vicar of Christ. Politics are only a branch of ethics; ethics depend on the moral law, of which, as of the revealed law, the pope is the guardian and judge; and hence the Council of the Vatican declares him supreme and infallible in morals no less than in faith. This is the only possible remedy for political atheism, for it makes the pope supreme under the natural law, from which the state holds, as well as under the revealed law, and subjects to his authority as vicar of Christ the whole moral order, as well as the Christian dogmas and sacraments; and while it gives him no direct power in temporal affairs, it gives him supreme authority to judge of the morality of the acts of temporal princes and governments, as well as of the acts of private individuals, and to subject them to such ecclesiastical discipline as he judges proper or necessary. The evil has originated, so far as Catholic

nations are concerned, in the assumption of a natural moral order that is not within the jurisdiction of the vicar of Christ, and in regarding kings and princes, states and empires, as independent of the papal authority. If we do not misapprehend the syllabus, and the reach of the decrees of the Council of the Vatican touching the papal supremacy and infallibility, this opinion, which had become so widespread, and done so much harm to religion and society, can no longer be held by any Catholic. A remedy, then, is now applied, and the Gallican dualism and political atheism are henceforth to be treated as *formal*, as they always have been *material*, heresies.

The war is now really between the church and atheism. The real enemy to be combated to-day is not heresy, is not rationalism even, but downright atheism, the denial of the divine dominion or sovereignty, which is as rank atheism as the denial of the divine being. Prince von Bismarck, in his persecution of the church, represents the atheistic spirit of the age, the spirit which meets us in some of its forms in the greater part of the literary and scientific works that issue from the non-Catholic press, in the popular journalism of all nations even when it affects to be Christian, in the Internationale and all other associations and movements for social reform, ostensibly for philanthropic ends. The archbishop of Westminster has shown it in his noble lectures on the "Four Great Evils of the Day;" the energetic bishop of Cleveland understands and denounces it, and so we suppose, since the Vatican Council at least, do all our bishops and priests, though many of them may be so engrossed with the pressing local affairs of their own dioceses or parishes, that they have little time or thought to devote to its consideration. But it is pressing home upon Catholics everywhere, and must soon become for all of them, and even for non-Catholics, the great absorbing question.

The *National Zeitung*, of Berlin, says, as cited above: "In the end this battle must become a battle of intelligence, and upon that territory the Jesuits, ghostly or worldly, with all their dogmas, and the miracles of the saints to boot, will come to grief." Passing over the sneer at the Jesuits, and the miracles of the saints, we agree with Bismarck, that the battle will not only become in the end, but is already, the battle of intelligence, or between intelligence and ignorance, though if he supposes the intelligence is on his side, he is wofully mistaken. Protestants and infidels pretend

that they are the enlightened portion of mankind, and represent the intelligence of the race. No stronger proof of their ignorance could be given, than this very pretension. We know something of Protestant and infidel intelligence, and were, when we were of them, up to their general level, nay, it is no boast to say, we were in their advanced ranks; and yet, when we became a Catholic, and had opened to us some glimpses of Catholic intelligence, we were appalled at our previous ignorance. The Catholic child that knows his catechism has a higher, broader, and deeper intelligence, than is dreamed of by the most intellectual and highly cultivated infidel or Protestant philosopher. The whole Protestant and infidel intelligence, science, and learning might be extinguished, and the world suffer no loss.

This proud and conceited non-Catholic world may have made some supposed useful applications of scientific principles, discovered by Catholics, or at least, by persons trained in Catholic schools or under Catholic influences; but they have shed on every important subject they have handled, darkness, not light. Their science is a sham, their learning is untrustworthy, their histories are a tissue of lies, and their morality, when not cant and hypocrisy, is borrowed from the sty of Epicurus. Under their influence, society has lost the conception of the spiritual order; has lost its faith in God and providence, abolished the law of nations, and sapped the foundation of liberty and authority, rejected the very bases of civilization and social progress, resolved right into expediency, justice into force; and torn by ceaseless revolutions, and alternating between despotism and anarchy, society is once again on the high road to barbarism. They the enlightened portion of mankind, and they superior in intelligence to Catholics? Bah! Tell that to the marines.

EDUCATION AND THE REPUBLIC.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1874.]

The great misery of society is in the fact that the people do not and cannot discriminate, and are carried away by half-truths, or by some particular phase of truth. The human mind never does or can embrace pure, unmixed falsehood, and it is the true mingled with the false, or truth misapprehended, misapplied, or perverted, that gives currency to error and renders it dangerous. It was the mingling of the true and the false in regard to religion that gave to the so-called reformation its destructive power, and it is the mingling of the true and the false in regard to education that vitiates the popular theories of its necessity or utility in developing and sustaining the virtue of the people.

The revolutions of the last century, continued in the present, were and are defended on the ground of the natural perfectibility of man or the race, and the assumption that error, vice, and crime originate in external causes, come from without, not from within, from a vicious training and a vicious political and social organization. Godwin, a Protestant minister, and husband of Mary Wollstonecraft, maintains that all the evils that afflict mankind spring from bad political government, and proposes as a remedy the abolition of all government, all authority, and the recognition of pure, unmitigated individualism. Robert Owen held that our characters are formed, not by us, but for us by purely external circumstances amidst which we grow up. The Internationals adopt the views of Godwin, only they propose to do by violence, by fire and sword, what he proposed to effect only by "peaceful agitation." But, wise Mr. William Godwin, whence came bad governments? Dear Mr. Owen, whence came these villainous circumstances? And dear Internationals, as you believe neither in God nor the devil, and hold that human nature in itself is all right, be so good as to explain to us the origin of these evils against which you wage such fierce and relentless war.

Now the perfectibility of man is unquestionably true, but that he is indefinitely perfectible by *natural means*, causes, or influences, as Condorcet held, is as unquestionably false. Man's natural progressiveness is determined by

his specific nature, which is finite, and has its bounds beyond which it cannot go. But supernaturally, as regenerated by the Holy Ghost in Christ, man is progressive even to the infinite. The perfectibility of man is a Christian doctrine, and can be effected only by supernatural means, or the grace that flows from the Incarnation. The doctrine of man's perfectibility or progressiveness, save from infancy to adult age, was not known to the Greeks and Romans prior to their conversion. The gentiles held that men and nations naturally deteriorate with the lapse of time. But since all these modern revolutions and revolutionists reject the supernatural, scoff at the Incarnation, make a mock of the crucified God, and place all their reliance on simple unassisted nature, they have no ground for asserting their doctrine of human perfectibility or the natural progressiveness of man; and consequently all political revolutions, social changes, or educational systems based on it are founded in error, and must turn out worse than failures, as all experience proves.

It is singular that men who deny the supernatural, God, and providence, and assert only the natural, should hold the sufficiency of nature, and ascribe all the evils they war against to unnatural or extra-natural causes. If there is only nature, these evils must have originated in nature, therefore from within, not as they pretend, from without. Religion, we are told one time, is an invention of the priests; but how could there be priests before there was a religion? The priest presupposes religion. Another time we are told that tyrannical rulers invented religion as a means of enslaving the people and of tyrannizing over them. But though rulers may abuse an existing religion, or a religion that has a strong hold on the people, for such a nefarious purpose, yet it is somewhat difficult to conceive how they could invent a religion, or how it could serve such a purpose with a people hitherto absolutely destitute of all religion! We are told again that man is naturally religious, that religion is a law of his nature, or that he is naturally prone to superstition, and that it is this natural law or disposition that has created the priests, and that it is to this natural law or disposition that crafty rulers appeal to support their power. But what has been may be. If there is only nature, and nature has hitherto produced the evils you seek to get rid of, what assurance have you that it will not, in spite of all efforts to prevent it, continue to produce

them? Do you expect by nature to rise above nature, to get out of nature, or to make for yourselves another nature? Do you not know that from nature you can get only nature, and that you cannot by your nature make your nature more or other than it is?

Now unhappily the system of education in vogue is based on the very principle that underlies all these modern revolutionary and social reform movements, that is, the natural perfectibility of man, or his progressiveness by his own natural forces, or by natural means; that is, it is based on a falsehood, in plain English, a lie, and Carlyle has well said, "the first of all Gospels is, that no lie shall live." We do not think the age overrates the importance of education, for Solomon has said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." The error is in not discriminating between a false and mischievous education and a true and salutary education. Education based on the principle that man is naturally perfectible, and which aims to cultivate the faculties of the soul in relation to the natural order alone, can never be beneficial either to the individual or to society. Nothing is more false than Goethe's doctrine, on which he appears to have acted through his long life, and which he inculcates *ad nauseam* in his "Wilhelm Meister," that the end of education, and therefore of life, is self-culture, or the harmonious and complete development of all the natural faculties of the soul. Schiller was no better, for if he aimed at the ideal, as our German friends say, it was only an ideal in the natural order, to be attained or realized, if realized at all, by our natural faculties. Bulwer, Lord Lytton, shows, like Schiller, a straining after the ideal, but it is always an ideal of nature, and the religion which he so lavishly introduces in his later novels has in it no supernatural element, and never raises man above nature. He was—as "Kenelm Chillingly," his last novel, shows—only a wise and accomplished pagan, like Goethe, and had never approached the frontier of the Christian kingdom. The highest possible culture of our whole nature, intellectual, æsthetic, domestic, and social, does not advance us a single step in the way we should go, or toward the true end or destiny of life. Man being perfectible or progressive only by aid of the supernatural grace of Christ, no education not based on the supernatural principle in which Christianity itself originates can aid us in our life-work, be a good and salutary education, or help us either individually, socially or politically.

Here may be seen the reason why the Holy Father and the whole Catholic hierarchy reject the educational system now in vogue with non-Catholics, assert the insufficiency of merely secular education, and demand for Catholics a Catholic education. We do not credit all that is said against our public schools by individuals who are unacquainted with them, nor do we attribute to them or to their influence the growing immorality of American society. The evil is not especially in the schools, but in the paganism, or secularism, which pervades the American community, on which our public school system is based, and which American children imbibe with their mother's milk, and far more effectually from the domestic and social atmosphere in which they are reared than from the public schools themselves. But it is clear that we cannot in these schools give our children a Catholic education, or educate them in relation to the supernatural order, or in relation to the true destiny of the soul. We cannot, in them, train up the child in the way he should go.

It is not so much what is taught or inculcated in the public schools that renders them objectionable to us Catholics, as what is not and cannot be taught or inculcated in them. They are and must be either sectarian or secular schools, and in either case exclude the true principle of moral and religious life. The education they give or permit to be given is a false, because an unchristian education. He who is not for Christ is against him, and separation from him is death; for his is the only name given among men in which there is life for the soul, life for men, or nations. An education that omits him as its central and informing principle, or fails to recognize him as its alpha and omega, its beginning and end, is simply an atheistic education, and can train up the young generation only as pure secularists, and to feel that they are free from all moral or social obligation, from all accountability to any power above themselves, and from all law not imposed by their own will. The stream cannot rise higher than its fountain. An education founded in nature alone, can give nothing above nature, nor do any thing to strengthen or perfect it; for nature without God, or severed from God, is simply nothing, and we know no philosophy by which nothing can make itself something. Such an education is repugnant to the principles and conditions of life, and can give nothing better than "death in life."

This is not mere theory or speculation. It follows, indeed, from the invariable and inflexible principles of reason and revelation, but it is confirmed by daily and hourly experience. The public schools are not the sources of the moral corruption becoming almost universal in American society; they are at most only the exponents of the false principles and ideas that generate it. They are impotent to check it, because impotent to infuse any principle of moral or social life. The education given has no power to restrain the evil passions or propensities of men, and leaves them to the unrestrained workings of their fallen nature. These false principles and ideas in which the American youth are educated—still more out of school than in it—and which sectarian and secular schools can do nothing to correct, are the real sources of the moral, domestic, and social corruption of the American people. This corruption, especially since the late civil war, is hardly less, perhaps even greater among the easy classes, than that of ancient Sodom and Gomorrha. From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, there is no soundness in us. We are one mass of rottenness. There is no longer even common honesty, and no man knows whom he may trust. The leaders of our society are engaged in transferring the money in their neighbors' pockets to their own. Our financial system is as inflated as our currency, and the active governing capital of the country is invested in paper, and consists in certificates of stock, or evidences of credit, that is to say, of debts which are counted as wealth—so long as payment is not demanded. But let payment be demanded, and forthwith there comes a panic; the assets, though ample as paper assets, are found to be unavailable, and banks, bankers, and brokers suspend, and thousands who yesterday thought themselves independent, or amply provided for during life, find themselves reduced to utter poverty and misery. The whole system is a sham, a fraud, and designed solely to enrich a few sharpers by impoverishing the many. The cry of the Exchange is "confidence," that is, "give us your money, and take our due-bills, without asking us to redeem them. Then all will go smoothly." No doubt of it. We know nothing more disturbing than to be called upon to pay our debts when we lack the wherewith to pay them; it disorders the digestion, and upsets one's equanimity; or when I O Us are discredited, and will no longer pass current. The Exchange is quite right. It is confidence that is wanting.

Aside from our general financial system, as hollow as a soap-bubble and as unsubstantial, though it reflects with rare brilliancy all the hues of the rainbow, the individual frauds, peculations, and defalcations, in all positions of trust, are becoming alarmingly frequent and on a scale so large as to be almost sublime. The government has its army of revenue-officers, and a still larger army to keep watch over them. Detectives are everywhere, and everywhere detectives are needed to act as spies on the detectives. Trust can safely be placed nowhere. We want keepers for the keepers, who themselves equally require keepers. If the criminal can bid the highest, the police fail to arrest or to discover him.

In the whole history of the world we can find nothing to match the irreverence and impudence of young America, whether male or female. The question between modesty and immodesty is, which, upon the whole, pays the best? Children grow up without respect for their parents, and without filial reverence or affection. They are wiser than the old fogies the law recognizes as their parents. Husbands and wives, after the honeymoon is over, have little confidence in one another, and neither can do or say any thing that is right or proper in the other's eyes. Even the mother loses the maternal sentiment, and seeks, or suffers, the destruction of the fruit of her womb before it is born. Such, in general terms, is no exaggerated description of our American society, though we would hope not without some, even many, individual exceptions. The reformation has gone to seed in secularism, and secularism is now bearing its fruit. We ask, then, how can sectarianism or secularism which produces this state of things supply a remedy? How can a system of schools based on either, or on the assumption of man's perfectibility by natural means and influences alone, do any thing to remedy this state of society, or to restore our American people to moral or social health? What new principle or what new power can a purely secular education introduce to counteract the deleterious causes and influences now at work among us? It can only accord with secularism, and cultivate and perpetuate the principles that are working our moral and social ruin.

For these reasons it must be obvious to every reflecting mind that, however powerful our public schools may be in sharpening the wits of their pupils and rendering them efficient for evil, they cannot be relied on to work any moral

or religious melioration of society. No melioration can come from nature; any melioration possible must come in the divine order, from principles and influences which proceed from a source above nature, from the Christian order, the order of grace, which places before men and nations a supernatural ideal, and while accepting nature elevates it by regeneration in Christ, and infuses into it the supernatural disposition and strength to aspire to that ideal and to realize it in life. The reliance that our statesmen, politicians, philanthropists, journalists, and platform orators pretend to place on our public school system, whether of the higher or lower grades, to maintain the virtue of the people and to preserve the free and healthy working of the republic, is manifestly and undeniably misplaced. Our most corrupt and dangerous classes are our educated and governing classes, and under the influence of the secularism which it represents and fosters, the American people are manifestly deteriorating. The history of Greece and Rome should teach us the impotence of mere intellectual and æsthetic culture to save a nation.

Hence the condemnation of purely secular schools and the necessity of Catholic education. The only support for private or public virtue is religion, is in training the people in those principles which religion alone introduces and sustains; and the only religion is Christianity, the Christian religion, inseparable alike from Christ, the incarnate Word, and the Catholic Church. The sects are all from the devil; they form no part of the church of God, and have no lot or part in the Man Christ Jesus, the only mediator of God and men. None but the Catholic Church can train up the child in the way he should go, or educate in accordance with the principles of the life and the destiny of man and society. Obviously then the church is the only competent educator, and only a thorough Catholic education has or can have any value for men or nations. There is no use in multiplying words about it; there is and ever has been but one religion, and that is the Catholic religion; there is and ever has been but one law of life, the law committed to the church, to be applied by her to the government of men and nations. These heathen superstitions, these ancient and modern sects, are all vain pretenders, and are as far from being the true religion as man or Satan is from being God. We must dismiss once for all the notion that there is any religion or any possibility of salvation for the soul or for

society outside of the Catholic Church. All notions or persuasions of the sort are from Satan, and defamatory of Christ, whose only bride is the church, whom he hath purchased with his own precious blood, and who is one and all beautiful. She alone knows his will, and can educate in accordance with it.

Yet we must not hastily conclude that the simple establishment of schools placed under the supervision of Catholics will of themselves suffice. The mere fact that a class of boys is taught by a Catholic instead of a Protestant will work no wonders, if he teaches substantially the same things and in the same spirit. We have found no worse or more troublesome boys than some of those who attend our parochial schools. Education alone does not and will not suffice. Grace must accompany instruction, or instruction even in the faith will not suffice for virtue. It is little the lessons of the school-room can effect, if they are counteracted in the home or the streets. Domestic discipline inspired by Catholic faith must go hand in hand with the school; and in no small number of Catholic families this domestic discipline is sadly wanting. Into the causes of this lamentable lack of domestic discipline we need not now inquire, but there can be no doubt that it is one of the great drawbacks on the efficiency of our Catholic schools. It has been a hard struggle for our Catholic people to pay out of their poverty their quota of the tax to support the public schools, and then to establish and sustain Catholic schools of their own, and we must not be surprised to find them in many respects very defective in their appointments.

But the gravest defects we discover, or think we discover, in our Catholic schools of all grades appear to us to be comprised in this one grand defect, that the education given in them is not thoroughly Catholic. Most of the text-books used in our colleges and parochial schools are far from being distinctively Catholic. The class readers which have fallen under our notice, with one or two exceptions, though containing pieces written by Catholics, are hardly better fitted for Catholics than Lindley Murray's series of English readers, and far inferior in a literary point of view. They seem to be prepared, with a view of not containing any thing offensive to Protestants, by liberal or namby-pamby Catholics, and with the hope of the publishers of getting them introduced into the public schools. We attended, some years since, an examination of the schools of the

Christian Brothers in a foreign city, and we found the text-book in natural philosophy in which the pupils were examined, absolutely irreconcilable, at least in our judgment, with Catholic principles. The properties of matter, as taught to these Catholic children, not only exclude the Catholic dogma of the Real Presence, but are such as a sound philosophy itself rejects.

Indeed in our examination of the higher education given in Catholic schools, colleges, and universities, we have found, or thought we found, it far from being thoroughly Catholic. The Christian schools, colleges, and even the universities of mediæval times, were modelled after, and we may say were based on the imperial schools of pagan Rome. The branches studied were the same, and their traditions were preserved, as they are even yet in the classical colleges in the United States. For languages the Latin and Greek, and for the division of studies the trivium and quadrivium are retained. Christianity in Catholic colleges is superadded, but it does not transform the whole system of imperial education. Especially is this true of our higher schools, since the fifteenth century, or the so-called renaissance. The pagan classics, in Catholic colleges as in others, have since formed the basis of the education given. Christianity, when introduced at all, has been taught only in juxtaposition with heathenism, as an accessory not as the principal—seldom, if ever, as the informing spirit of the education imparted. We do not ask that the Greek and Roman classics be excluded from all part in a liberal education, but we do object to their being made its principal part, or foundation. Now our Catholic young men graduate, even from our Catholic colleges, with a pagan substructure, merely varnished over or veneered with Catholicity, which a little contact with the world soon wears off.

The Holy See did not, when a few years since the question was raised in France, forbid the study of the pagan classics in Catholic schools, but it did require that care should be taken that the pupils or students should be well grounded or instructed in the Catholic religion. We have no sympathy with the present infidel movement to abolish the study of the Greek and Roman classics in non-Catholic colleges, and to introduce the study of the physical sciences in their place. That would only aggravate the evil we complain of, instead of remedying it, and is part and parcel of that system of education which is intended to exclude God and Christ from

the school and to make all education purely secular—of the earth earthy. The world is to-day further removed from Christian principles than it was in pagan Greece and Rome, and the study of the classics in non-Catholic schools can have only a Catholic tendency. The classics contain the highest religion that is to be found in non-Catholic society. Abolish them, and non-Catholic education would be thoroughly utilitarian, materialistic, and atheistical. Yet Catholics do not draw their religion from the classics, and do not need them as a medium of its instruction or mental culture. Their religion is independent of them, stands on its own bottom, and is infinitely superior to them; but it can only suffer when the pagan classics are, as in the old pagan imperial schools, made its basis and the main structure of education.

Now we do not deny that in all our Catholic colleges religion is distinctly recognized and taught, and taught in all that is necessary for educated laymen in an age or country where heresies are unknown or the faithful are guarded against them by the civil authorities, but not in all that is needed in an age or country where the dominant public sentiment is intensely anti-Catholic, where all opinions are legally free, and where every thing is questioned, and nothing is held to be settled; or where atheism is accounted a science and blasphemy a virtue. The graduates from our Catholic colleges come out into the world ill-prepared for the struggle that awaits them, and the majority of them either give up the contest or make a miserable compromise with the enemy. The weakest, the most milk-and-water, and least zealous and efficient Catholics one meets are precisely those who have graduated with high honors from our Catholic colleges. They are taught the principal dogmas of the church, but they are not taught the relation of these dogmas to one another, or shown the light they throw on each other when taken in their dialectic connection and as a whole. They are taught the practice of religion, but are not shown the dependence of the practice on the dogmas out of which it grows.

Worse than all, the graduates go forth without the philosophical principles that either enable them to grasp religion in its unity and catholicity, or to defend it logically against the heterodox philosophy of the day. We have now lying before us a dozen or more text books, which are or have been used in our colleges, not one of which furnishes prin-

ciples on which Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Sir William Hamilton, J. Stuart Mill, Spinoza, or Cousin can be scientifically refuted. The young Catholic graduate is not armed for the battle he must wage for the faith or fall into doubt or indifferentism. In point of fact, he is from his training a better classical scholar than a Catholic, and is unable to assign any reason for his faith but that of external authority alone, which, without the internal authority, is hardly satisfactory to any but very devout Catholics. Under the system of education still continued in our Catholic colleges with slight modifications, we have seen the educated classes of all old Catholic nations become infidels, Gallicans, revolutionists, or so-called liberal Catholics, a polite name for secularists or those who would divorce society from religion, or the state from the church, and under pretence of supporting liberty and social progress, really exert all their influence in favor of cæsarism, or Bismarckism. What sort of Christian education can the Italian and Spanish revolutionists have received that permits them to make war on the pope, the clergy, the religious orders, the Catholic religion itself, and still to profess, perhaps to believe, themselves Catholics? And these really anti-Catholic leaders, like Cavour, Minghetti, Castelar, and Figueras, have all been trained in Catholic schools and colleges. It is all very well to ascribe the fact to the perversity of human nature or to satanic influence, but may it not, in part at least, be ascribed to the defective or half-pagan education given in our schools and colleges?

Then there is in our judgment another grave mistake in not educating children and youth for what is to be their state in life. We have heretofore touched upon this, but its importance will justify us in treating it again. We take France before the revolution of 1789. She had too large a number of liberally educated men, raised by their education above the state of the laboring and industrial classes, unfitted by it for the humble pursuits of their parents, and unable to obtain an honest living by any career opened to them by their education. The learned professions, even the clerical, to which few of them, by the way, had any vocation, were crowded, over-crowded; the government could absorb but comparatively few of them in its offices; without any patrimonial estates to fall back upon, discontented, hungry, closed in on every side, they became an educated mob, whose only chance to gratify their tastes, or even to

obtain a bare subsistence, was to agitate for a revolution, and seek a general *bouleversement* of the state and society; not otherwise could they gain a position and a livelihood. Revolutions are never made by those who have a career open to them in which bread can be honestly obtained. The leaders of the internationals are not ignorant mechanics and laborers, but educated and desperate men. Italy and Spain may be cited as examples of the sad effects of educating children and youth out of their normal state in life, as may also Catholic Canada. It is the principal cause of the political and social unrest of the modern world, which generates insurrections and revolutions, and which is so fruitful in crimes, and, as physicians who have studied the question say, of insanity and suicide.

We do not regard the multiplication of Catholic colleges, even in our own country, designed to give what used to be called a "liberal education," as a cause for gratulation, and we cannot but think a smaller number than we now have, organized to be feeders of two or three universities properly so called, and of the highest class, say one for the cis-Alleghany region, one for the trans-Alleghany region extending to the Rocky Mountains, the other for the Pacific slope and mountain territories, would be a great gain. It would release to be missionaries so much needed, a large number of priests now shut up in colleges, employed in teaching and educating the children for a state far above that of their parents, which can be little else than a source of misery to them and of evil to society. We think, with regard to female education, it is a great mistake on the part of our teaching communities of women to make an accomplished lady of the daughter of a washerwoman or keeper of a dramshop, or to give to any of their pupils habits, tastes, and wants which unfit them for the circle in which they were born, in which alone their parents can move, and out of which the daughters themselves, except in rare instances, cannot hope to marry. We know no class more to be pitied, or who are doomed to greater misery through life, than the sons and daughters of the laboring classes, who, if they have no vocation to religion, are, so to speak, *declassed*, by their education. We know nothing worse, even for parents, than to feel that their sons and daughters are trained for a higher rank in the social scale than their own, and are too knowing and too refined for them. It kills all domestic discipline, destroys all mutual confidence

between parents and children, makes the children tyrants over their parents, and, if the parents assert any parental authority, it makes home a sort of hell upon earth. Children should be trained to live and perform their duties in the sphere of life in which their parents live and move, never, as a rule, for a higher social sphere; though in a world like ours, where little is permanent, no harm can come to the children of the upper classes from being trained to habits of industry or useful labor, but possibly, in the vicissitudes of life, no little benefit.

Very full religious instruction and training of the children of all classes is a necessity, and should never be neglected, if possible to be given. But religion teaches us, whatever our lot, if we have food, clothing, and shelter, though of the coarsest kind, therewith to be content. We cannot but think that "the masses," as this materialistic age says, were better educated, though unable "to read, write, or cipher," in those ages and nations when they had a fixed costume which never changed its fashion from generation to generation, and the peasant or the citizen never dreamed of going out of his class, but was as firmly wedded to it as the nobleman was to the class of nobles, than they are now, when the hierarchical classification of society is abolished, and a universal struggle rages to get up and to pull or keep down. We as a Catholic honor the poor, and hold ourselves bound to do all in our power for their benefit both here and hereafter, but we do not believe it for their benefit to educate or assist them out of their class. We ourselves sprung from them but by our own personal efforts; yet never have we known in the life of letters the peace and contentment, the joy and happiness we experienced as a day-laborer, though in the roughest and hardest species of labor. Our suffering and our sin began when the future reviewer and author aspired to a station reputed above that to which his parents, once wealthy, were reduced, and in which he had the happiness to be born. How gladly, we have often since felt, would we return to the humble condition of our childhood and youth, and exchange all the honors of the orator, the author, and reviewer, for the peace and security of the wood-chopper, the mechanic, or the ordinary farm laborer, aspiring only to perform well his day's work. It is a great mistake to say that the wealthy are the favored classes, though perhaps the class most to be pitied are those who have all the habits, tastes, and wants which only wealth can

satisfy and yet have no wealth, those who constitute the class Carlyle calls "gigmanity disgigged," those who are educated to ride in a gig, and have no gig in which to ride. We are told in the life of that great saint, Thomas of Villanova, that these were the special objects of his compassion, whom he studied in his exhaustless charity to relieve without wounding their sensibility or their shrinking delicacy. These suffer a thousand-fold more than the poor of the laboring classes.

The nobility have great vices and crimes, but they have also in all countries and ages great virtues, and not seldom prove themselves capable of grand penitences and grand expiations, and it is worthy of remark that their class has furnished to the church the great majority of the saints in the calendar. But the most wretched class of all, and the most barren of good works in all ages and nations, is the so-called middle class, who are the chief worshippers of Mammon, engrossed in money-making or the accumulation of wealth. They are the chief supporters of heresy, and the bitterest enemies of the religion of Christ. Their conversion is, in modern society at least, wellnigh hopeless, and they are the class that now governs the world, especially our own country, since the success of the abolition fanatics. Hence the great difficulty in the way of converting the ruling people to the Catholic religion, which teaches, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." They are inborn Protestants.

But to return to our subject; we must remember that it is the smallest part of the education of children and youth that is given or acquired in the school-room or the college hall. Much more is acquired in the family, in the streets, in social intercourse, and from the general tone of thought and manners of the country. The children of Catholic parents breathe the atmosphere breathed by the children of non-Catholic parents, and after a little while become assimilated to them, even in their physical features. We cannot, let us do our best, educate the rising generation in schools and colleges much above the average standard of the adult generation. Education itself has no reforming or progressive power. Its office is conservative, and it serves chiefly to perpetuate, and to perpetuate the errors as well as the truths and virtues, of the generation that educates. This law is as effective in a Catholic as in a non-Catholic community. In Catholic schools, as in non-Catholic schools, the children of Catholics, without other influences than ed-

ucation itself can exert, may fall below, but can hardly rise above the average faith and virtue of the Catholic community to which they belong.

Hence we cannot expect Catholic schools and colleges themselves to correct the defects even in Catholic education. The great mass of men, educated or not, are men of routine. Schoolmasters and professors follow the beaten track, and educate as they have been educated, nor is it desirable that they should do otherwise, or become innovators. The correction must come from an authority above the school or the college, and in subordination to which either must educate. But even authority, however clearly and distinctively it speaks, cannot correct the evil at once. The educators must be themselves educated up to the standard of the reform to be introduced, and as these comprise the parents and the whole Catholic people, the education of parents or the people must precede the introduction of any effective reforms in the schools and colleges. The pagan element, condemned in the syllabus, and repudiated by the Council of the Vatican, must be eliminated from the intelligence and manners of the Catholic people, before it can be eliminated from the schools.

This work of educating the people and of eliminating from their minds and manners the paganism which has long created in the intelligence and habits of Catholic populations a dualism which has resulted in the destruction of Christendom, is the work of the bishops and clergy, aided in some feeble measure by the Catholic press, if really and thoroughly Catholic. The education of the young is also their charge, and should go on *pari passu* with the education of the people; but for ourselves we hold the education of the people the more important of the two, for if not thoroughly grounded in the principles of Catholicity, and thoroughly emancipated in their intelligence, habits, and manners from paganism, they will neutralize the best training childhood and youth can receive in the school or college. We asserted as much nearly forty years ago, and observation, reflection, and experience have tended only to confirm it. The new generation can be educated only by the old, which can only reproduce its own image and likeness. Hence nations that have not the church, and have no supernaturally endowed body of instructors, can never be progressive nations, and the nation that ceases to be progressive begins to decline, and if left to itself is sure to fall.

All modern nations, save in the material order, if not even in that, are deteriorating, and only those in which the Catholic faith survives have any recuperative energy. The others, like the great pagan empires of antiquity, must eventually fall, and when they fall, they fall to rise no more.

We agree with our non-Catholic countrymen that education is necessary to save or to sustain the republic, but we do not admit that a sectarian or secular education, the only education non-Catholics can give, will answer or even aid that purpose. Such education is worse than none, and the more universal and complete you make it, the greater the danger to the state and to society, as all modern experience proves. Man and society are created and exist for God, and neither can forget him and neglect his law, and live. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Non-Catholic nations have no true life, only a life in death, as was the case with the ancient gentile nations, who apostatized from God, their Creator. Only Catholic nations have any real life, or any hope for the future. Only a thoroughly Catholic education of both old and young can secure their safety, for no other is in accordance with the moral or divine order of the universe. The universe is created and ordered to the glory of the Word, as is well maintained by Frederic Schlegel, and virtually by Bossuet in his Discourse on Universal History, and, we may add, the glory of the Word, or Logos, is in the Incarnation, in which he becomes the Mediator of God and men. The order of creation is set forth and secured in religion, the Catholic religion, embodied since the Incarnation in the Catholic Church, of which the successor of Peter in the see of Rome is the visible head. It is only through this church that God is or can be glorified, or safety for men or nations be secured.

Obviously, then, it is only a thorough Catholic education, such as only the church can give, rendered efficient by her sacraments, that can secure the eternal salvation of the soul, or sustain the republic. If grace supposes nature, nature needs grace, and is impotent without it. The natural is for the supernatural, and not for itself, and therefore never suffices for itself. Reason is insufficient for reason, and if not supplemented by revelation, is a blind guide, may lead us into difficulties, but is impotent to extricate us from them; for it was never intended to operate without the supernatural revelation, of which the church is the only depositary. The church alone, the spouse of Christ the Lord, has the secret

of life, knows the purpose of creation, and can educate men and nations for its fulfilment, or serve as the medium of light and strength to enable them to fulfil it, and attain to their supreme good.

Catholic nations, through perversity, or even an education more or less defective, may decline, and fall very low, as we see in the present condition of Catholic Europe, but as long as the seed of faith remains, they retain a recuperative power, and have in the church all the means and influences necessary to their revival or restoration. We, therefore, without believing our Catholic schools perfect or holding them alone sufficient to keep, in a community like ours, even our Catholic population thoroughly Catholic, support them as the only Christian schools in the country, and hold that the education they give is the only education that can in the slightest degree contribute to the safety of the republic. There is no less short-sightedness than injustice in refusing us our proportion of the public schools.

But in conclusion we must add that education in the ordinary sense of the word, while it is necessary to preserve the children of Catholic parents to the church, will not suffice to save our daily deteriorating republic. Nothing will save it but the conversion of the people to Catholicity. The blaspheming heretic, the self-conceited infidel, puffed up with the pride of his pretended science, may treat this assertion with derision, but we know whereof we affirm, and in humility, not in pride, we tell them that they have nothing to teach us. We believe that this country will yet be converted. Catholicity has the right to it, for it was first discovered by Catholics, and taken possession of in the name of the cross. But our reliance for its conversion is on missions and the missionary orders, who strengthen the faithful, quicken their zeal, and recall them to their duties.

GALLICANISM AND ULTRAMONTANISM.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for July, 1874.]

The secular and sectarian press do not seem to have yet learned that the distinction formerly for some centuries insisted on between Gallicans and ultramontanes, since the Council of the Vatican, has no place among Catholics. Those who were called Gallicans have been condemned as heretics, and none except those formerly called ultramontanes can now be reckoned as Catholics. Gallicanism was always a heresy, and though implicitly condemned in the Council of Florence held in 1439 under Pope Eugenius IV., had not been explicitly condemned till the Council of the Vatican under Pius IX. Prior to the action of that council Gallicans, though, as say the theologians, *material*, were not *formal* heretics. But now, unless excused through invincible ignorance, they are formal heretics, incur the guilt of heresy, and form no part of the Catholic body. They are as much aliens from the church or commonwealth of Christ as are Arians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Methodists, spiritists or devil-worshippers. It is a great mistake to regard Gallicans and ultramontanes as two parties existing in the church. Only ultramontanism is Catholic.

Yet we are asked almost every day, and by Catholics too, what we mean by Gallicanism, and comparatively few of those who should be well informed on the question have any but vague and very uncertain views of what is the essential Gallican error. The error itself is older than France, as old as the first Christian emperor who attempted to interfere authoritatively in ecclesiastical affairs, and we may find it defended by the Merovingian sovereigns of Gaul, or the Neustrian Franks, who copied the cæsarism of Byzantium; we may find unmistakable traces of it among the German successors of the Frank emperor, Charlemagne, especially with Louis of Bavaria and his lawyers and courtiers; but it is called Gallicanism, because the French theologians were its principal defenders in the fourteenth and subsequent centuries, and because the French mind had the principal share

**The Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages.* By M. Gosselin, Director in the Seminary of St. Sulpice. Baltimore: 1853.

in moulding it into shape, systematizing it, and giving it currency. It is summed up and presented in its least objectionable form, by the assembly of the French clergy, or rather by Bossuet by order of the king, or his minister Colbert, in what are well known as the four articles of the French clergy, adopted March 19th, 1682, which we here insert:

I. Beato Petro ejusque successoribus Christi vicariis ipsique ecclesiæ rerum spiritualium et ad æternam salutem pertinentium, non autem civilium ac temporalium a Deo traditam potestatem, dicente Domino: *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo;* et iterum: *Reddite ergo quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari et quæ sunt Dei Deo:* ac proinde stare apostolicum illud: *Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit; non est enim potestas nisi a Deo; quæ autem sunt, a Deo ordinatæ sunt. Itaque, qui potestati resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit.* Reges ergo et principes in temporalibus nulli ecclesiasticæ potestati Dei ordinatione subjici, neque auctoritate clavium ecclesiæ, directe vel indirecte deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi a fide atque obedientia, ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi posse; eamque sententiam publicæ tranquillitati necessariam, nec minus ecclesiæ quam imperio utilem, ut verbo Dei, patrum traditioni et sanctorum exemplis consonam omnino retinendam.

II. Sic autem inesse apostolicæ sedi ac Petri successoribus Christi vicariis rerum spiritualium plenam potestatem, ut simul valeant atque immota consistant sanctæ œcumenicæ synodi Constantiensis a sede apostolica comprobata, ipsoque Romanorum pontificum ac totius ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab ecclesia Gallicana perpetua religione custodita decreta de auctoritate conciliorum generalium, quæ sessione quarta et quinta continentur; nec probari a Gallicana ecclesia qui eorum decretorum, quasi dubiæ sint auctoritatis ac minus approbata, robur infringant, aut ad solum schismatis tempus concilii dicta detorqueant.

III. Hinc apostolicæ potestatis usum moderandum per canones spiritu Dei conditos, et totius mundi reverentia consecratos; valere etiam regulas, mores et instituta a regno et ecclesia Gallicana recepta, patrumque terminos manere inconcussos; atque id pertinere ad amplitudinem apostolicæ sedis, ut statuta et constitutiones tantæ sedis et ecclesiarum consensione firmata propriam stabilitatem obtineant.

IV. In fidei quoque quæstionibus præcipuas summi pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas ecclesias pertinere, nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium nisi ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.

These are the four famous Gallican articles as drawn up by the assembly of the French clergy, and published by order of the king, Louis XIV., and made the civil law, obligatory on all the clergy, religious, and theological professors and seminaries of the kingdom. The strangest thing to us

is that anybody with a grain of sense could for one moment suppose it to be possible to defend them without ceasing to be a Catholic. To our understanding they are from beginning to end, not Catholic, but decidedly and unmistakably anti-Catholic. They place the Gallican church, a simple national or particular church, above the Catholic or universal church—a part above the whole—and virtually make Paris, not Rome or the apostolic see, the centre of authority, and the king, not the successor of Peter, pope and supreme judge of Catholic faith and tradition. We can conceive nothing more impudent or more arrogant than for thirty-four French bishops, assembled without any authority of pope or papal legate, by the civil authority alone, and acting under its direction, to decide questions both of faith and discipline, manifestly not of their competence, any more than it was of Louis XII.'s conciliabulum at Pisa, composed of five rebellious and excommunicated cardinals, to excommunicate and depose the reigning supreme pontiff. The pope Alexander VIII. condemned, it is some consolation to know, the acts of the French assembly, and by his supreme apostolic authority declared them null and of none effect, although the king in his pride paid as little respect to the papal authority as does Prince von Bismarck.

Bossuet, who drew up and defended these four articles, was a learned prelate, an eloquent preacher, and in some respects a great man; but he had, if a profound knowledge of Catholic dogmas, but a sorry knowledge of Catholic principles, or the divine constitution of the church. The church he defended was not the Catholic Church, but a French church with no visible infallible head, and no central authority but the French king, and he sunk, not seldom, the Catholic bishop in the French courtier. He never grasped the church in her unity and catholicity, or understood that she is essentially papal or that the pope brings to the church the apostolic authority, which including indeed the episcopal power as the fountain the stream or the greater the less, is essentially distinct from the episcopate and above it. According to this great representative of the French mind, the papacy depends on the episcopacy, grows out of it, or is, as it were, built up by it. The pope, on his theory, supplies no element not supplied, at least in germ, by the episcopacy. If united or morally unanimous, the bishops possess all apostolic power inherited by Peter and his successors. Yet, as we understand the constitution of the church, she is

apostolic, founded on Peter, and the papacy, the perpetuation or continuousness of the apostolate, is at her foundation as well as at her summit. Take away Peter or the papacy, but leave all else as it is, and the church has ceased to exist. She has no unity, no catholicity, no personality, and would be as destitute of life and power as the human nature of the Son without its hypostatic union with the divine person of the Word. Christ is himself the invisible person of the church, and without the papacy he would have no visible representative in the church and she would not be a visible church, and the invisible church is God himself. As we understand St. Cyprian in his "De Unitate Ecclesiæ," all power or authority in the church takes its rise in unity, in the chair of Peter, and emerges from it. Hence Bossuet's theory that the council, that is, the episcopal body, if morally agreed, or virtually unanimous, holds and can exercise all the functions of the papacy, is manifestly repugnant to the constitution of the church as the living body of Christ.

The four articles presented here to our readers are what is called Gallicanism, and opposed to ultramontanism, that is, to Catholicity, but as far as our observation extends Gallicanism is usually restricted, in the popular mind, to the denial of the papal infallibility, or the assertion that the papal definitions of faith and morals are reformable, unless they have received the assent, at least tacit, of the universal church. We have met not a few theologians even, who denied being Gallicans, though they defended the first three Gallican articles, because they asserted the infallibility of the popes when they are teaching in matters of faith and morals the whole church. We have heard men assert that infallibility, and yet deny that the power of the keys extends over kings and princes, or that the church has authority, direct or indirect, over them in temporals or matters pertaining to this life. The learned and respectable Sulpician, M. Gosselin, has not to our knowledge been counted a Gallican. Yet he asserts no natural or logical relation in the order of things between the temporal and spiritual, and seems to have forgotten that God works according to order, and is strictly logical in all he does. He defends the popes in the middle ages, it is true, from the charge of usurping the power they exercised over kings and sovereign princes, confirming them on their thrones, deposing them and absolving their subjects from their oath of allegiance, &c.,

on the ground of human, not of divine right. What they did was by the request or assent of the people, or the *jus publicum* of the time. Such a ground of defence in the case of a human ruler would be valid, but is only an insult or a blasphemy in the case of the pope, who holds the power, if at all, by divine right. Can it be that these excellent writers are innocent of all conception of the dialectic character of the church, that they are only memory-machines, and never think of looking below the surface, or of inquiring into the meaning of the dry facts they collect from their varied erudition? They seem to us to have a marvellous lack of mental power, and to be quite incapable of mental digestion and assimilation. No wonder that the age becomes materialistic and feeble in character, that faith is everywhere dying out, piety losing its robustness, charity degenerating into a weak and watery sentimentality, and the *parti-prêtre*, so-called, is decried, or held up to the contempt of the people. Men cannot live and thrive on mental or spiritual husks. If compelled to feed with swine, they will grovel with them. We respect authority, we obey its faintest whisper, but we have ill-learned our holy religion, if Christianity is not broader and deeper than the papal definitions, which present it only piecemeal or under special aspects; if it is not an indissoluble whole, with all its parts linked inseparably together, and having each a strictly logical reason of being in the intrinsic truth of the whole. Christianity is not sustained by an extrinsic authority alone, but also by its intrinsic truth and internal laws. The business of the theologian is to bring out this intrinsic truth, these internal laws, these logical necessities (for all in Christianity is necessary, that is, necessary *neccessitate ex suppositione*, nothing arbitrary or anomalous), and place them in their real order and mutual relations. The papal definitions aid us in understanding the faith and enable us to avoid the errors contrary thereto, but they by no means teach us the whole faith in its unity and catholicity, or Christianity in its integrity, as the one law expressing the divine wisdom and purpose in creating, sustaining, and governing the universe as a whole and in all its parts whether natural or supernatural. He who includes only them in his *objectum fidei* will believe truth indeed, but he will have only a fragmentary faith. Much not defined must be embraced, and sound theological conclusions, though one premise is certain only by natural reason, cannot be denied without error against the truth, only a shade less sinful than heresy itself.

I. The fundamental objection to Gallicanism was not so much that it denied any explicit definition of pope or council, as in the fact that it misconceived and misstated the essential nature and office of the church as the kingdom of God on earth, especially the necessary relation of the spiritual and the temporal, or of the two orders. The Gallican will listen to no argument drawn from the natural supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal. He admits, or may admit, that the spiritual is superior to the temporal, that the church represents higher and more important interests than are represented by kings and princes, but not therefore has she any authority over them, any power to subject them to her discipline for any thing they may do or not do in the civil order. The first article of the Gallican declaration denies that she or the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, has received any power over them, or any right to subject them to the authority of the keys, to depose them, to release their subjects from their civil faith and obedience, or to absolve them from their oath of allegiance, since no express grant, the Gallican contends, of power to that effect, is found in the commission to the church or the papacy. He does not or will not see that such power does not need to be expressly granted, for it follows as a necessary consequence, if not expressly denied, from the supremacy or superiority of the spiritual order, and from the fact that the temporal in the very nature of things exists for the spiritual, or is ordered *ad spirituale*. The body is the organ of the soul, not the soul of the body; and power belongs to the superior, not to the inferior.

The Gallican, excluding by his first article, all papal or ecclesiastical power over kings and princes in temporals or civil affairs, makes the temporal order independent, and places it on an equality in power with the church, and consequently, virtually denies both the supremacy and the superiority of the spiritual order. As the church is Catholic and is the only medium through which the divine sovereignty is exercised in the government of men and nations, the Gallican, by denying the power of the church in the civil order, withdraws that order from the sovereignty of God, from all subjection to the divine order, and asserts as we have so often maintained, political atheism, all but universally dominant in our age. By withdrawing the temporal or civil order from its obligation to consult and obey the spiritual order, the Gallican makes that order subject to no law but

what it is to itself, leaves it perfectly lawless, free to act, to govern, to tyrannize, and to oppress, as it pleases. The nations have lost liberty just in proportion to the rejection of the papal authority by their governments and the governing classes. Kings and princes are but men and stand as much in need of the restraints of religion and the discipline of the church as any other men.

The learned and excellent M. Gosselin, author of the book before us, with admirable simplicity attempts to defend the popes from the charge of usurping the power they exercised over civil rulers, in the middle ages, excommunicating and deposing sovereigns, and absolving their subjects from their allegiance, by maintaining, as we have said, that they did it, not by divine right, but by human right, by the request or assent of the people, by the *jus publicum*, which even the sovereigns themselves recognized. This theory was very favorably received even by many Protestants, and before the publication of the decrees of the Vatican on the supremacy and infallibility of the successor of Peter in the see of Rome, true vicar of Christ, was very widely adopted even by theologians who wished to avoid Gallicanism. Yet it contained all the Gallican virus. The popes never professed to excommunicate or depose a sovereign prince by virtue of human right, but in every instance, as far as we recollect, did it by virtue of their apostolic power, as the vicars of Christ. This is manifest from the judicial sentences themselves. Boniface VIII., in the well-known bull, *Unam Sanctam*, which his successor declared that he could not revoke, because it contained a dogmatic decision, plainly defines that the power of the pope extends over sovereigns as well as over private individuals, and a greater or more learned pope, though grossly calumniated and greatly decried, and made prisoner by the grand-son of St. Louis, has rarely sat in the chair of Peter. It is idle, or worse than idle, to pretend that the popes knew not by what title they held their power, and we are obliged to hold, as Catholics, that they could neither mistake nor misrepresent it.

And here, perhaps, we hit upon the secret of the chief opposition manifested at the time of the council against decreeing the papal infallibility. The sovereigns and their ministers were made to believe that the definition affected them, and concealed a blow at their independence. At first sight it would seem that the definition could change, as it

really has changed, nothing in the relations of the church to the state, and in no case could it invalidate the concordats between the two powers. It is purely an internal question between the church and her own members. But it was remembered that several popes had asserted for the papacy, by divine right, the superiority of the spiritual power over all orders of men in the church, whether cleric or laic, governors or governed, princes or subjects, states, communities, or individuals—that supremacy indeed of the spiritual over the temporal which inheres in the spiritual, and is inseparable from the kingdom of God on earth. Once it is defined that the pope is infallible in deciding questions of faith or morals in the universal church—and the question of the office, powers, and prerogatives of the supreme pontiff is as much a question of faith as is the mystery of the Blessed Trinity or the Incarnation—that supremacy cannot be denied without heresy. Gallicans deny the papal infallibility in order to be able with less scruple to deny the papal supremacy. It is the papal supremacy, its superiority to the temporal power, and its right to exact their obedience to the law of God, that kings and princes and their ministers and courtiers dread—not the papal infallibility in itself considered—because it is the only practicable barrier against arbitrary power, tyranny, and oppression, or practicable guaranty either of order or of liberty.

The power claimed by the popes in the middle ages, exercised with so much effect by the Gregories, the Innocents, and the Bonifaces, and which we contend is inherent in the spiritual order represented by the vicar of Christ on earth, is a power that kings and emperors, statesmen and courtiers do not like, have never liked, have always resisted when they dared, and the very memory of its former exercise makes them fear, drives them mad, and fills them with satanic rage. No matter whether politicians are monarchists, imperialists, republicans, or democrats, they are all equally hostile to the papal supremacy, and seek its destruction. How often have we heard even men who believed themselves orthodox Catholics exclaim, "I respect as sincerely and as profoundly as any one can the priest at the altar, and so long as he keeps in his place and minds the proper duties of his office; but let him come out of the sanctuary, and interfere with politics, and seek to control the affairs of this world, and I cease to respect him, I refuse to obey him, and if need be, will resist his authority as I

would that of any other man"! Who defines the place and duties of the priest, and decides when he does or does not keep in his place? Do the sheep teach, keep, or guard the shepherd? Power, wisdom, and knowledge are from above, not from below.

There is no doubt that, as alleged, many troubles were occasioned and public tranquillity sometimes disturbed by the exercise of the papal power against the chiefs of the civil society. But whose was the fault? Was it the fault of the pope laboring to bring them into subjection to the law of God, and to secure the reign of justice, or of the rulers who abused their trusts, despoiled the church of her goods, the religious of their houses, the clergy of their rights, and labored to bring the kingdom of God into bondage to the kingdom of man—to the civil tyrant, as Prince Bismarck is now doing in Germany? Does the good man cause the disturbance that follows his attempt to resist and expel the midnight robber or assassin who breaks into his house to plunder it, or to murder his wife and children? We are aware that those statesmen and politicians, courtiers and court-lawyers, who decry the papacy, when the question is between Peter and Cæsar, always assume that Peter is necessarily in the wrong, and Cæsar in the right. Cæsar is always a poor innocent, working every moment for the highest and best interests of society intrusted to his charge, and at every moment, on every side, thwarted by the fiery Peter, the haughty triple-crowned old man who puts himself in the place of God, and would be worshipped as God, by some insolent churchman, or intermeddling friar. Yet the reverse of all this is the verdict of history. The haughtiness, the arrogance, the insolence, the wrong, are on the other side. The pope is set for the defence of the kingdom of God, that is, the kingdom of right and justice—and therefore for the defence alike of both civil and spiritual society; for whatever tends to repress the spiritual, saps the very basis of the civil, and all history proves that the pope is ever too slow to arrest the tyranny, oppression, the wickedness of crowned monsters, such as were Henry IV. of Germany, the Hohenstaufen, Henry of Luxemburg, and Louis of Bavaria, to name no others. The papal forbearance to strike, and liberate the church from oppression and society from wicked and lawless rulers, is one of the marvels of history.

But by assuming that in the bitter struggle between the

pope and the emperor the emperor is always in the right and acts always within his legitimate sphere, encroaching never on the rights of Peter, as do the enemies of the Holy See, the Gallicans are able to make out a rather strong case against a certain number of popes. But with the facts of history before us we cannot do this, unless we assume that the church—which the Gallican as well as the Catholic holds to be the visible kingdom of God on earth, instituted by him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, for the assertion, defence, and maintenance of the divine sovereignty in human affairs—has no rights which human governments are bound to respect, and is wrong whenever she resists Cæsar in his efforts to bind her by his enactments, and to prevent her from fulfilling her divine mission, or obeying the law of God. To be able to do it, we must assume the absolute subjection of the spiritual to the temporal, of the church to the state, and, if we know what we assume, of God to man—which is the denial of God and the deification of man or the state. This is atheism, and Gallicanism has resulted, historically, in atheism, wherever it has had its free development. It is long since official France has ceased to believe in Christ, and Paris had as large a proportion of avowed atheists in the sixteenth century as in the nineteenth.

For ourselves, we see nothing in the power exercised by the popes over temporals in former times to be dreaded by any one who believes in God, loves justice, and desires to advance civilization; but we do see great need of it, in our modern society, and great evil in the fact that its exercise is now almost everywhere impracticable. On any ground it was far better to depose a prince by the judicial sentence of the highest and most venerable authority under God, than by a Parisian or a Berlin mob. The disorder occasioned by the excommunication and deprivation of that impersonation of perfidy, the emperor Frederic II., shrinks to nothing in comparison with the disorder and social dislocation caused by the old French revolution. Not only order, but liberty, intellectual and civil, social and individual, was infinitely larger and securer under the guardianship of the popes than it is in our modern society, which imprisons the vicar of Christ, despoils the church and the poor, invades the rights of God, and contemns the clerical body. What has society gained by deposing the pope, rejecting the papacy, learning to contemn the clergy, to scoff at religion, and giving itself

up to be governed by the Cavours, the Bismarcks, the Victor Emmanuels? Is there any one, not blinded by Satan, that does not see that the moral and spiritual power exercised by the papacy over civil rulers in the middle ages is needed, and that society languishes for the want of it? It was supposed that we had hit upon a notable expedient for supplying its loss when we referred certain grave questions between us and Great Britain to the arbitration of an international commission which met at Geneva, and our infallible press boasted of the discovery of a new method of settling peaceably international disputes. But we had, in fact, only adopted a miserable imitation of the arbitratorship exercised by the pope, sometimes *motu proprio*, to stay the effusion of blood, and restore peace, sometimes by the request of the litigant powers, throughout mediæval Europe. The congresses of nations so often resorted to since the prevalence of political atheism, in order to settle their territorial, commercial, and other international disputes, show the want of that arbitratorship, and at the same time the impossibility of getting a substitute by any human contrivance. The pope, as the spiritual father of Christendom, the common father of all Christians, elevated above all national prejudices or partialities; in dignity and sacredness of office and person above all temporal sovereigns, without dependence on or fear of any, holding from God alone, was, so to speak, the natural moderator, we may say the divinely appointed moderator, of Christendom.

The power is inherent in the papacy, and is not, as some pretend, abandoned, nor can it be abandoned; but the popes do not now assert it, because now, however much needed, they cannot exercise it any more than they could when the church was in the catacombs, as possibly she may soon be again. The pope can excommunicate a Catholic sovereign like Victor Emmanuel, and the excommunication will have its spiritual effect, but no visible social or political effect. Excommunication cannot force him or his ministers to desist from their sacrilege and robberies, or to restore their ill-gotten gains. The pope can pronounce sentence of deposition against a sovereign, and absolve his subjects, but there is no civil power to be called in to execute it. Only his Catholic subjects would heed it, and these, if distinguished from liberal Catholics, who are sure to support the deposed prince, are, in every modern nation, as with us, a feeble minority, without power, or able only to protest, to suffer,

and to people heaven with confessors and martyrs. No, there is nothing to be feared by sovereign princes and states from this formidable power, for it can be exercised with effect only in Christian nations or within the bosom of a Christendom, scarcely a vestige of which any longer remains.

2. The second Gallican article, supporting itself on the decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance, which it asserts were confirmed by the Roman pontiff and approved by the whole church, declares the superiority of the council to the pope and the power of the council to sit in judgment on the sovereign pontiff, and thus subjects the papacy to the episcopacy. But the acts of the fourth and fifth sessions of Constance are of no authority, for they were held, if we are not out in our history, before the council had been legitimately convoked, or was a council at all, and while the assembly voted by nations. There were three claimants of the papacy: Gregory XII., Peter de Luna, called in his obedience Benedict XIII., and Balthazar Cossa, called in the Pisan line, John XXIII. The true pope was neither of the last two, but unquestionably Gregory XII. of the Roman succession, whose election was legal and regular, and the Council of Constance was a true council only after he had convoked it, opened it, authorized it to proceed to the work before it, and then resigned his authority into its hands. Consequently the anti-papal acts relied on were not acts of a general council, and have no authority but what they derived from the confirmation of the newly elected Pope Martin V. But he never confirmed them, for he only confirmed what had been done *conciliariter*, which these manifestly were not. The furious Gallicans, the Chancellor Gerson, who some Frenchmen would fain persuade us was the author of the "De Imitatione Christi," Pierre d'Ailly, who became archbishop of Cambray, and some few others, chiefly Frenchmen connected with the Paris University, which more than once imagined itself, like modern German professordom, the infallible teacher of the universal church, and whose brevet of orthodoxy must be sued out by the pope, no doubt did all in their power to get their episcopalianism accepted, and to subordinate the papacy to the episcopacy, as a necessary step in the subordination of the episcopacy to the national authority; but they did not succeed, though they came so near succeeding that their party was able, down to the Council of the Vatican, to per-

suade a very large portion of the Catholic body that they had reduced the true Catholic faith to the state of a simply tolerated opinion. Gallicanism is episcopalianism, for, if the pope is inferior to the council, and the bishops united can judge, bind, or depose him or in any way restrict his power, the papacy is inferior to the episcopacy, since the bishops united have no more authority than each one has singly. Each bishop has the plenitude of the episcopate, and each bishop has all that the whole body united has, if we believe what St. Cyprian says that the bishops hold the episcopate *in solido*. The Gallicans forget that the apostolate is not included in the episcopate, created by it, or developed from it. The bishop of Rome as bishop is only the equal of any other bishop. He is superior because the apostolate, which is superior to the episcopate, is attached to his see, and to no other, and therefore is the Roman see, the apostolic see, the mother and mistress of all the churches. The apostolic authority and prerogatives descend from Peter alone to his successor in the see of Rome, not in common from all the apostles, and are inherited by our Holy Father Pius IX. only among all the bishops. The Gallican forgets that bishops are successors of the apostles only in the respect that the apostles were bishops; only the bishop of Rome succeeds to the apostolate. We may be wrong, but it seems to us that theologians have not always been careful to mark with sufficient distinctness the fact that the apostolate, which remains always in the church, is a distinct power from the episcopate, and over it. The apostolate includes the episcopate and in its plenitude, but the episcopate does not include the apostolate. The pope, as succeeding to the apostolate, holds the apostolic authority in its plenitude directly from God: bishops hold apostolic authority only by delegation from the apostolic see, and hence, if they receive their episcopal character immediately from God in episcopal consecration, they receive their mission and jurisdiction from God only through the pope or the apostolic authority.

3. The third article, assuming the papacy to be inferior to the episcopacy, and that the pope is subject to the council, subjects the exercise of the papal power to canons founded by the spirit of God, that is, by the bishops in council, and, also, to the rules, manners, customs, and institutions of the *kingdom*, especially such as obtain in France. As a matter of prudence, the church will always respect the manners, customs, institutions and usages of every country,

so far as they are not repugnant to Catholic faith and duty, but the pope is not bound to conform to them, and may disregard them whenever or wherever in his judgment the interests of religion, which are also the interests of civil society, require him to do so. The pope is above canon-law, and is not bound by any disciplinary canons, whether established by general councils or the popes his predecessors, and though he ordinarily or in ordinary cases conforms to them, he is free to set them aside, to derogate from them, or institute new canons, whenever he judges it necessary for the interests of religion or the good of the church, as Pius VII. did in France in 1801. The pope is not a parliamentary sovereign, like the queen of England, or a republican chief magistrate, like the president of the United States. His power is supreme over the whole world, in spite of Gallicanism. The ultramontane doctrine—always free from inconsistencies and from pandering to the civil power and to national prejudices, as Gallicans do, who profess to be Catholics because Frenchmen, and who seldom fail to place the king before God—has been sustained by the Holy Father in the Council of the Vatican, the fathers of the council approving. The following extract from the decree defining the power of the pope will show how absurd it is to treat Gallicans as Catholics, or even as a party in the church. There are no Gallican Catholics, and those once called ultramontanes are simply Catholics, and the only Catholics.

"Wherefore, resting upon the clear testimonies of Holy Writ, and following the full and explicit decrees of our predecessors the Roman pontiffs, and of general councils, we renew the definition of the œcumenical Council of Florence, according to which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter the prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and is the head of the whole church and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church: as is also set forth in the acts of the œcumenical councils, and in the sacred canons.

"Wherefore, we teach and declare that the Roman church, under divine Providence, possesses a headship of ordinary power over all other churches; and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate, toward which the pastors and faithful, of whatever rite and dignity, whether singly or all together, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, not only in things which appertain to faith and morals, but like

wise in those things which concern the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the world, so that being united with the Roman pontiff, both in communion and in profession of the same faith, the church of Christ may be one fold under one chief shepherd. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can depart without loss of faith and salvation.

. . . . . .

"Wherefore, they wander away from the right path of truth who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman pontiffs to an œcumenical council, as if to an authority superior to the Roman pontiff.

"Therefore, if any one shall say that the Roman pontiff holds only the charge of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the entire church, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the whole world; or, that he possesses only the chief part and not the entire plenitude of this supreme power; or, that this his power is not ordinary and immediate, both as regards all and each of the churches, and all and each of the pastors and faithful; let him be anathema."

We have dwelt thus long on these three Gallican articles in order to show that the error of Gallicanism is not confined to the fourth article, and we have made this extract in order to prove that the Holy Father in the council has done something more than define the pope to be infallible by the assistance of the Holy Ghost when teaching *ex cathedra* the universal church in matters pertaining to faith and morals. They who asserted that the papal definitions are reformable unless accepted by the church are indeed condemned, and it is defined that they are infallible and therefore irreformable by force of the papal authority irrespective of any assent of the church. But what we deem of most importance in the controversies of the day, is the utter condemnation of the first three articles, which controvert the supremacy of the vicar of Christ, both in relation to the civil power and in relation to the council or the episcopacy, and the assertion of the primacy of jurisdiction of the successor of Peter in relation to both, indeed a primacy of the whole world. The assertion of this papal supremacy strikes a death-blow to the wretched Gallican dualism and to the political atheism which enfeebles and kills the life of every modern nation. We found, more than twenty years ago, that we could not give an effectual refutation of political atheism and defend the divine sovereignty over the political order, or maintain the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual, unless we

could assert for the pope the very power which Gallicanism denies; and that we could as easily defend Anglicanism as Catholicity on Gallican principles. Gallicanism is the doctrine of sovereigns, their lawyers and courtiers, but never has been the doctrine of the church.

When we were young and weak in the faith, and were just beginning to try our hand at defending the church, we thought it was a great advantage to be able to subordinate the papacy to the episcopal body, and not to be obliged to defend the infallibility of the pope; but thanks be to God, whose mercies to us have been infinite, we were soon led to the discovery of our ineptness, and to perceive that the papacy, instead of being the weak point, is the strong point of our faith; that the church is really built by our Lord on Peter, and is primarily and essentially papal in its character. We even dared defend the supremacy of the spiritual order in face of Cæsar, and to defend those great popes who smote crowned monsters, sacrilegious, perjured, and faithless sovereigns with the sword of Peter and Paul, and to applaud their conduct, instead of apologizing for it, or seeking to explain it away. We did not in this secure the sympathy of the Catholic public; we heard scarcely a whisper of encouragement, and some eminent prelates, who assured us that they agreed with us, were shocked at our imprudence in publishing it. Why agitate such questions, it was said to us, and throw them as so many firebrands into our midst? Why raise them at all? The doctrine has been long since abandoned at Rome, where you will receive few thanks for reviving it. It is not obsolete, we answered, and we revive it, for Catholics are suffering for lack of the truth we are defending. It is in reality a living question, the great controversy of the day. The great heresy we have to combat to-day is political atheism, and pray tell us how we can war successfully against that, if we are debarred from bringing out the great truth which those great mediæval popes asserted and exemplified in their acts? We cannot do it on your puny Gallican principles, and if we may not draw on the highest-toned and most vigorous ultramontanism, we must quit the fight—as for a time we did.

But, happily, the church herself has now spoken, the infallible pontiff has made his voice heard, and the way that was closed to us is opened now to the new generation of warriors for the glory of God and the good of souls. The day of timidity, when men took counsel only of their fears,

and prudence permitted one to speak only with hushed breath, has gone by. The dangers so sedulously guarded against have come; all that could be lost, has been lost. The Holy Father is despoiled and a prisoner; but, in revenge he is no longer oppressed by the weight of the protecting sovereigns, and he is as free as he was under the pagan emperors of Rome. He is now free to act as the spiritual chief of the world without being hampered by the advice of friendly courts, dictated by their own state policy, or suggested by their fears for their crowns. The thing these powers, who from the peace of Vienna in 1815 took the pope under their special protection, as they have since the Grand Turk, were always dreading might happen, and always afraid the imprudent zeal of churchmen or too earnest Catholics might provoke, *has* happened. The worst that could be done has been done, and the folly of the cautious, timid, non-aggressive policy enjoined on the church by the protecting powers made manifest. The Holy Alliance remedied no evil, checked no dangerous tendency: it only exasperated the already discontented populations, and gave ample opportunity to the secret societies to organize and spread themselves as a vast net-work all over Europe. Instead of destroying the revolution, the Holy Alliance, the work of Madame Krüdener and Alexander of Russia, only caused it to take deeper root in the heart of the European populations, implicating, unjustly, the church in the odium it incurred for itself. The Holy Father has now among the sovereigns no protectors, and no *advisers*, and though a prisoner, is free, and has been free since the publication of the syllabus, Dec. 8th, 1864, a date never to be forgotten. His only protector now is the omnipotent God, a much surer reliance than the princes of the earth.

The syllabus and the decrees of the Council of the Vatican have not disarmed the enemies of the papacy, have not converted them into friends; but they have broken the fetters, and opened the mouths of earnest Catholics. We can now, under shelter of the highest authority, refuse to keep any terms with Gallicanism, and can defend Catholic faith as faith, not as simple opinion, which we could not do before. We can now bring out and insist on the very truth that is needed to combat successfully the dominant heresies of the age, without fear of political complications, or of embarrassing the diplomatic relations of the Holy See with secular governments, for nearly every government is at open war

with the papacy, as Spain, Italy, Mexico, Brazil, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Russia; and those which are not, as Great Britain and the United States, are governed by no love of the church, but by the necessities of their internal condition. The country in the world where Catholics are the least hampered in their faith and worship, singularly enough, is Turkey, a Mahometan power, and the only existing state we are aware of in the world, devoted to the Holy See, is the little republic of Ecuador in South America. Satan has done his worst, and gone the length of his tether. But enough of this.

The Holy Alliance, formed at the close of the wars growing out of the French revolution of 1789, undertook to secure the peace of Europe by the merciless repression of every revolutionary tendency. The pentarchy had all possible secular advantages in its favor, but it signally, let us say, shamefully failed, as all the world knows; and its failure, the insurrections of 1820, the revolutions of 1830, of 1848, the reëstablishment of the Napoleonic empire in 1852, the Italian campaign made by imperial France against Austria at the bidding of Count Cavour and the carbonari, in 1859, the annexation of the Papal Legations, the duchies, and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies to Piedmont, which followed, the prostration of Austria with the connivance of France at Sadowa in 1866, and her expulsion from Germany, the final extinction of unhappy Poland in 1863, the revolution in Spain that dethroned and expelled the noble and kind-hearted Queen Isabella, in 1868, and the Franco-Prussian war, the invasion and taking possession of Rome by the godless Piedmontese government, the fall of the second empire of France in 1870 and the accession of the government of defence the 4th of September of the same year, prove, or ought to prove, to the conviction of all men, the utter folly of seeking a cure for the deep-seated plague of modern society from any possible political combinations or any secular medicaments at all. There is no help in any arm of flesh. The only possible remedy must come from the fearless and energetic assertion of the Catholic truth and the rights and sovereignty of God; by rallying around the vicar of Christ, strengthening him by our prayers, supporting him by our offerings, consoling him by our fidelity to truth, by suffering bonds and imprisonment with him, and if need be death itself for him. It is only as we fall back on the resources of the church as the spiritual kingdom of

God, revive the spirit of the apostolic age, and cease to seek any political or secular ally, that we can reconvert the nations and restore Christendom. This is the work now before the new Catholic generation. A glorious field opens to the ambition of whoever aspires to live for the greater glory of God, to serve nobly his fellow men, and win the crown of life.

We must be allowed here to remark that the primacy of the pope, supremacy we say, derogates nothing from the dignity of the episcopacy or the ordinary jurisdiction of bishops, as we read in another paragraph of the acts of the Council of the Vatican. The pope in the council says:

"So far nevertheless, is this power of the supreme pontiff from trenching on that ordinary power of episcopal jurisdiction by which the bishops, who have been instituted by the Holy Ghost and have succeeded in the place of the apostles, like true shepherds, feed and rule the flocks assigned to them, each one his own; that, on the contrary, this their power is asserted, strengthened, and vindicated by the supreme and universal pastor; as St. Gregory the Great saith: My honor is the honor of the universal church; my honor is the solid strength of my brethren; then am I truly honored when to each one of them the honor due is not denied."

The papacy strengthens the bishops and sustains them in the independent exercise of their powers by uniting them in one body under one head, and strengthens each with the strength of all. The danger to the authority of the bishop does not come from the pope, and it is not against the Holy See he needs protection, but against the seductions or the tyranny of the secular or national authority. Separate the prelates of a nation from the Holy See, release them from papal authority and supervision, and they would have no power, and perhaps very little disposition, to resist the national authority, or to maintain their rights against it. They would fall under the national authority or the passions and prejudices of their nation, cease to be Catholic prelates, and become purely national or sectarian bishops, as we see in all countries where the bishops have cast off the papal authority, as in England, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and especially Russia, and separated themselves from the communion of the pope. They cannot maintain discipline or purity of doctrine, and they become slaves to the civil power, to popular opinion, to the body they pretend to be-

appointed to govern, or to this or that political order. Gallican bishops might preach submission to the subjects of the king, strict obedience to their civil rulers however tyrannical, but they had no freedom to rebuke the sovereign, to admonish him to rule justly, except in vague or general terms, and none at all to subject him to discipline, if he refused to heed their admonitions. Hence the government in France became corrupt and oppressive, and the people revolted against the church, overturned the altars, massacred or deported priests and religious, abolished religion, and attempted to live without God in the world.

We have asserted the supremacy of the spiritual order, and therefore of the pope as vicar of Christ, in both spirituals and temporals, but the reader should note that the power we assert for the vicar of Christ over kings and princes, or the civil power, is not itself a temporal power or sovereignty, but simply of the spiritual power over the temporal. As has just been said in the case of bishops, it is so far from trenching on the ordinary power or jurisdiction of the prince or the civil government, that it confirms it, and tends to render it secure, stable and permanent. The pope is supreme, is above the temporal sovereign, represents a higher order, declares and applies the higher law, the law of God under which the temporal sovereign holds, but he is not the temporal sovereign, nor does he exercise the ordinary jurisdiction or perform any of the ordinary functions of a temporal sovereign. The pope represents in the government of society, the divine sovereignty, or the authority of the King of kings and Lord of lords, and holds therefore, in relation to the civil power, the supremacy which the divine has over the human. As the divine does not derogate from the human, but founds and sustains it, so the papal supremacy does not derogate from the civil authority, but, under God, founds and sustains it. God is not man, because he makes man, nor because he is supreme over him. The pope, as the vicar of Christ, can be supreme over the prince, without therefore being himself a temporal prince, or having any temporal authority.

The temporal prince has no superior in the temporal order, and in that order the civil power or the state is supreme; but not therefore does it follow that the temporal order has no superior. It is precisely here where Cæsar is at fault, and Bismarck is out in his reckoning. The temporal order is not the supreme, or the highest order; above

it and over it is the divine or spiritual order. The pope, as representative by divine institution, of the spiritual order, that is, as vicar of Christ, is by that fact alone above and over the temporal prince who represents only the temporal or inferior order. The civil power is supreme in its own order, but its own order is not supreme; it is below the spiritual and subordinated to it. As the divine gives the law to the human, the spiritual to the temporal, so the pope gives, promulgates, or declares, and applies the law according to which the temporal prince must govern his states or rule his subjects. Yet it is the prince who holds and exercises the temporal power. The mistake of Bismarck is in holding, not that the state has no superior in its own order, but that its order has no superior, and is subordinated to no other. Hence he claims for the empire the right to subject to its authority entire society, civil as well as ecclesiastical, and all manner of persons whatsoever their state or dignity, and to punish as criminals those bishops and priests who choose to obey God rather than men. Spiritual persons are not amenable to civil judges; they pertain to a spiritual kingdom, and are justiciable only by the spiritual authority, and not till deprived of their spirituality can they be answerable to a civil tribunal. Civil laws which contravene the law of God, or of the divinely constituted spiritual society, are without force for the conscience, are no laws, but unjust, are violences, and not they who break them, but they who enact and enforce them, are the culprits.

This papal supremacy is as necessary to the support of the authority of temporal rulers as it is to the support of the ordinary authority and jurisdiction of bishops. The experience of the nations that have rejected it in whole, like Protestants and the schismatic Greeks, or in great part, as Gallicans, as we have already seen, proves it. The civil governments that assume the independence of the temporal order, and recognize for the prince no superior on earth, have no stability, and no order but despotism, which extinguishes all freedom and all activity. They are able to sustain themselves only by military force, pretty sure to fail them in every emergency; for soldiers are not mere automatons, but are men, with the thoughts, passions, prejudices, sympathies, hopes, and fears of men, and when bayonets think and feel the army can no longer be relied on. All governments are mined by secret societies and revolutionists. In no country is order or liberty assured; for in no country

do the ruling powers hold themselves amenable to the divine law which changes not, or the great body of the people feel themselves bound in conscience to respect and obey authority; for in none is there recognized any power but one's own private judgment to determine what is or is not legitimate authority, or to decide what is authority, and what is despotism. But on this point we have already said enough.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND CIVIL ALLEGIANCE.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1875.]

It would appear from the newspapers that ex-Premier Gladstone, the leader of the English liberals, has published a pamphlet in which he attacks papal infallibility, as declared by the Council of the Vatican, on political grounds, and makes an adroit appeal to the anti-Catholic prejudice of the mass of the English people. We have not seen the pamphlet, which, at the time we are writing, has not reached this side of the Atlantic; but, if it is correctly described in the *New York Herald*, it is simply the revival, for political effect, of the old cry of "No Popery."

We are not surprised at this act of Mr. Gladstone. We have never shared the confidence of our Catholic brethren of Great Britain and Ireland in this greatly overrated statesman; and, as long ago as 1854, we classed him with the satanic, or radical and revolutionary leaders of the time. We based our judgment chiefly on his untruthful and revolutionary pamphlet on Naples. That pamphlet showed us his unscrupulousness and the bias of his mind. He is not, never was, and never will be a statesman; and we have, as a Catholic and as an American citizen, always preferred D'Israeli, who is a statesman, as we have always preferred the English Tories to the English and Scotch Whigs. In this we have not had the sympathy of Catholics either at home or abroad; and we have stood nearly alone, as we did in our own country, against the late emperor of the French, and the policy of Louis Veuillot, the oracle of European Catholics. It is rarely that we find a Catholic in our days that is

not a blunderer in politics, that is, in our judgment, which is by no means infallible. "You were right in your judgment of Napoleon III.," said an eminent American prelate to us one day in 1864; "and we bishops were wrong, and we were so because we relied on the judgment of the French bishops." "But I did not rely on their judgments at all," was our reply. Time, unhappily, has justified us, and proved that the church had no worse enemy than the Nephew of his Uncle. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," yet we know not that what, judging with our human wisdom, we call political blunders, really are blunders. Our Lord never intended his church should stand in human wisdom, human strength, or human virtue; and it is only when, humanly speaking, the church is weakest, that she is strongest. Those blunders in human policy, as we esteem them, are doubtless permitted for wise and good purposes, and are sure in the end to redound to the glory of the church, by making it manifest to all the world that it is only the hand of God that upholds her, and preserves her in life and vigor.

Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, according to the telegraphic summary of it published in the *N. Y. Herald*, asserts that the decrees of the Council of the Vatican have changed the relations of the church to civil governments, so that a man cannot be at once obedient to the pope and loyal to his prince or the state. This charge, it pretends, is warranted by the decree of the council defining that the pope, when teaching *ex cathedra*, or officially, the universal church, is, by divine assistance, infallible, or exempt from error in all matters pertaining to faith and morals. To this the archbishop of Westminster, a life-long friend of Mr. Gladstone, replies in the following letter, addressed to the editor of the *N. Y. Herald*, and published in the same number of that popular journal:—

Nov. 10, 1874.

To the Editor of the *Herald:*—

Dear Sir—I assisted in framing the Vatican decrees, which have not changed one jot or tittle the obligations and conditions of civil obedience that Catholics bear towards the civil power. Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet hangs upon a contrary assumption, and falls with it. In proof of this assertion I assert:

First—That the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope was a divine truth before the Vatican Council was held, and that it was set forth and explained in the second and third parts of the book called *Petri Privilegium.*

Second—I gave sufficient evidence of this assertion in this, that the Vatican Council announced no new dogma, but simply declared an old truth.

Third—That the position of Catholics, in respect to civil allegiance since the council, is precisely what it was before.

Fourth—That the civil powers of the Christian world hitherto stood in peaceful relations with the infallible church, and this relation was often recognized and declared in the councils of the church before the Vatican Council, and, therefore, this is no new matter; and

Fifth—That the Vatican Council made no decrees in regard to the civil powers nor on civil allegiance, this subject being never even proposed.

Civil obedience rests on natural law. Revealed truth is the law of God. Society is founded in nature, and subjects are bound, in all things which are lawful, to obey their rulers. Society, when it is Christian, has higher obligations, and subjects are bound to obey their rulers for conscience' sake, because the powers that be are ordained of God. Of all this the Vatican decrees changed nothing because they touched nothing.

Mr. Gladstone's argument hangs upon an erroneous assertion. I can only suppose him to have been misled by a misplaced trust in Dr. Döllinger and his friends. On public and private grounds I lament this act of imprudence. But for my belief in Mr. Gladstone's sincerity I should say it was an act of injustice, and lament it as out of all harmony and proportion with the great statesman's life, and the first event to overcast a friendship of forty-five years. His public life hitherto has consolidated Christian and civil peace in the three kingdoms. This act, unless the providence of God and the good sense of Englishmen avert its evil consequences, may wreck more than the work of Mr. Gladstone's public career, and at the end of a long life tarnish a great name.

I remain your faithful servant,

✠ HENRY EDWARD,
Archbishop of Westminster

No member of the Council of the Vatican took a more conspicuous part than did the illustrious archbishop of Westminster, and no man living is better able to say what this council did or did not do. When he says the decrees of the council changed nothing in the relations of the church and the state, he simply states a fact within his own knowledge, not an opinion, whether his own or another's. The *schema* touching those relations prepared by the theologians was not acted on by the council, which was suspended before it was reached, and consequently must be regarded as *non-avenu*. To pretend that the decree of the council, declaring it of faith that the pope by the divine assistance is infallible as doctor or teacher of the universal church, has

in any respect changed the relation of the church to the civil powers, is absurd. The church has always been held to be infallible, and the pope has always been held to have plenary authority to speak and act for the infallible church in all her relations with the civil powers. Whether he is held to be himself infallible by divine assistance, or simply the official organ of the church, infallible by the same assistance, can in no respect affect those relations. The question of papal infallibility, decided by the council, is purely an internal question, and in no sense affects the relations of the civil or external powers with the church; for those relations, whether embodied in concordats or not, had always been through the pope with a church claiming to be infallible in matters of faith and morals, or matters pertaining to faith and morals. The church, in the definition of papal infallibility, put forth no claim to any infallibility that she had not always asserted; and the definition, that the infallibility is lodged in the pope as well as in the *ecclesia congregata* and the *ecclesia dispersa*, could not make any difference in the relations of the church to the state, or in her authority over individuals, and could by no means abrogate or weaken the existing concordats between the two powers, for it neither increased nor diminished the infallibility she was always and everywhere understood to claim by virtue of the indwelling Holy Ghost. Mr. Gladstone has been misled by Dr. Döllinger.

So much might be said in answer to Dr. Döllinger, Bismarck, and ex-Premier Gladstone on the supposition that the infallibility of the pope, as defined in the Vatican Council, had never been previously asserted. But such is very far from being the case. All the world knows that it had always been asserted by the whole church, and never denied except by some civil rulers, who have no authority in the church, and by their courtiers, lawyers, and courtly prelates, or such theologians who stood more in awe of the temporal prince than of the supreme pontiff. Gallicanism, as we have shown in discussing Döllingerism, was the doctrine of the sovereigns, at least when they wished to oppose the spiritual power, but never the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Of the nearly one thousand bishops assembled in the Council of the Vatican from all quarters of the globe, among whom were the profoundest theologians, the ripest scholars, and the most learned men in the world, not a single one denied or questioned the truth of the doctrine of papal

infallibility, or expressed any doubt of its having been the doctrine of the church from the first. A small minority of their number opposed the definition, but, if we are correctly informed, not one opposed it on the ground that it is not true. That would be an innovation in Catholic faith, or a departure from the *Semper eadem*. The definition was opposed as inopportune. Some thought the doctrine was already defined with sufficient explicitness by the decree of the Council of Florence, and the action of the sovereign pontiffs; and therefore held that no further definition was called for. Some opposed defining it, because it might irritate the temporal powers, and afford them a pretext for charging the church with innovating in her faith; some, because it might embarrass the controversy with heretics; and others, from national prejudice; but none, on the ground of the falsity or untenableness in theology of the doctrine itself. These were all overruled by a large majority, who decided, in defining it, that it had always been the faith of the church, and its denial had always been at least *material* heresy. No body of men, even on the score of human science, learning, and ability, could be collected from all the courts and universities of the world whose testimony on such a question would equal that of the Council of the Vatican, much less be competent to overrule it.

The church, in her definitions, does not introduce new matter of faith, or decree simply what henceforth is to be held as Catholic faith, but defines what, on the point in question, is and always has been the faith. The fathers of the Vatican did not simply decree that the papal infallibility, as they defined it, is henceforth *de fide* and not to be denied without heresy; but they testified with all the weight of their authority, supernaturally protected from error by the divine presence, that it had always been the doctrine of the church from her institution by our Lord himself. So of all the decrees of the church declaring the faith. They institute no new faith; they simply declare unerringly what is and always has been the faith. This excludes the specious theory of development. New definitions are not even new developments; they propose no new faith or new development of the primitive faith, but simply, when the faith has been denied, they reassert it, and when it has become confused or obscured in men's understandings they state it more explicitly or distinctly. The church has authority not only over all questions that bear directly on faith, but over all

those that affect it indirectly and remotely; and authority even in scientific theories and speculations to condemn whatever directly, indirectly, or remotely impugns the deposit of faith, but, in condemning them, she only opposes to them the old truth of which she—that is, the pope—is the divinely appointed guardian.

This is a sufficient reply to Mr. Gladstone's charge, that, in defining or declaring the papal infallibility, the church has changed her faith, or introduced a new faith. The court, in defining or declaring what is the law, neither makes nor changes the law. Mr. Gladstone ought to be lawyer enough to understand so much, and ought also to be theologian enough to know that, in defining or declaring the faith, the church acts in her judicial capacity, as *ecclesia judicans*, not as the legislature. But leaving this charge of change of faith, or innovation in faith, so foolishly urged by the Döllingerites, we turn to what we understand to be the gist of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, namely: The belief in papal infallibility is incompatible with civil allegiance, and mental and moral freedom.

Protestantism has almost everywhere thrown off the mask, and no longer pretends to oppose the church on theological grounds. It abandons its pretences to be a rival religion, and assumes what from the first has been its real character, that of a political movement against the church, or a movement to effect the independence of the secular order in face of the spiritual or divine government. In its greatest generality it may be defined to be the assertion of the supremacy of the human, and the denial of the sovereignty of God, as is implied in its fundamental principle, private judgment, which is purely human. All the objections Protestants now urge against the church, may be summed up under two heads: The claims of the church are incompatible, 1, with the allegiance the citizen or subject owes to the prince or state; and 2, with the rights of the mind, or mental and moral freedom. The state and the mind are both human; and consequently Protestantism simply sets up the human against the divine, and therefore indorses the primitive falsehood with which Satan seduced our first parents: "Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil;" that is, knowing them as God knows them, of yourselves without learning them from a master, or the law of a superior. Protestantism, inspired by Satan and obeying the suggestions of human pride, puts the human in the place

of the divine, the state in the place of the church, man in the place of God, and worships, instead of God, the devil, or one's own petty self. Under it man can brook no superior, bow the knee to no master, will be his own teacher and lawgiver, boast of his intelligence, freedom, and dignity, and, without knowing it, be a miserable bondman of Satan. Mr. Gladstone's objections to Catholicity prove it but too conclusively.

Mr. Gladstone contends that a man, in becoming a Catholic, forswears civil allegiance, and surrenders his mental and moral freedom. This, we believe, is the pretence of the whole anti-Catholic party in this country, in Great Britain and Ireland, and on the European continent. The allegation is not, that the church, being a false church, as are all Protestant churches, must therefore be hostile to the state, and to mental and moral freedom, or the rights of the mind, which would be a valid objection to her authority in case it is conceded or proved that she is a false church; but the objection actually urged is that she must be hostile to the civil power and the rights of the mind, because she claims to teach all men and nations infallibly the truth which God has revealed and commanded all men and nations to believe and obey. Supposing her claim to be well-founded, which is not denied in the allegation, the objection is very weak and very absurd, even blasphemous; for it assumes that the truth revealed by the Holy Ghost, infallibly declared, denies the rights of the state and of the mind. It is absurd, for neither the state nor the mind has or can have any rights which the truth denies, or which deny the truth; blasphemous, because it denies the divine sovereignty, and assumes that the Holy Ghost can teach what is false, and command what is wrong. The objection, as the lawyers say, is not well taken. It should be, not that the dogma of papal infallibility is incompatible with civil allegiance or mental freedom, for if the pope is really infallible, he can teach as the law of God only what is his law, and as obligatory only what really is obligatory on all men and nations, alike on sovereigns and subjects, the republic and the citizen, if the universal dominion and sovereignty of God is not denied;—but it should be either a denial in form of the dogma of papal infallibility, or the universal dominion and sovereignty of God. In either case the objection would be theological, not political.

In fact, no valid or tenable objection to the dogma of pa-

pal infallibility can be based on political or secular reasons. Mr. Gladstone and the Protestant press, in objecting to the church or the papacy on political and secular grounds, show their want of logic and their utter incapacity to understand the real question at issue. They wish to maintain that the claim of papal infallibility renders the church incompatible with the rights of the civil power and of the mind, which is absurd if the claim be well founded. If the claim be unfounded, that fact should be pleaded, or alleged in the declaration; and the allegation of that transfers the case at once from politics to theology. They are not only inept logicians, but very poor lawyers, and would do well to study Chitty, or some other respectable authority, on pleading. They lose their case if they are so ill-advised as to interpose a demurrer. If they simply demur to the claim they have no case, for, if the claim be conceded or passed over, no objection can be urged, since an infallible teacher can teach nothing that is not true, and therefore nothing incompatible with any rights the civil power or the mind has ever had or can have. There are no rights not founded in truth, and truth cannot contradict itself. The case does not come within the jurisdiction of the civil courts, and can be settled only in the court that has cognizance of theological questions.

We are not required in the present aspect of the case to discuss the theological question. For Mr. Gladstone and Protestants do not in their objections set forth that the papal infallibility is theologically false, and therefore incompatible with civil allegiance and mental and moral freedom: they object that papal infallibility itself cannot be asserted or believed without denying civil allegiance and mental and moral freedom. The objection, therefore, is to infallible authority itself; that whoever admits any infallible authority above or distinct from the state or civil power and the individual reason cannot be a loyal subject or citizen, and is mentally a slave. There is no human infallibility, and there can be no infallible authority except by divine appointment and the supernatural assistance and protection of the Holy Ghost. Papal infallibility rests on and represents the divine infallibility and sovereignty. In the last analysis, then, the objection is, that the acknowledgment of the divine infallibility and sovereignty is incompatible with mental freedom and civil allegiance. This is the real significance of Mr. Gladstone's objection. We said, in 1854, that he needed only another rubbing to become completely satanized, and

this additional rubbing he appears to have received in his late political defeat and loss of office. He now unites with Satan in asserting the authority of the human against the authority of God; for, as we have seen, his objection is no less forcible against Catholicity on the supposition that papal infallibility is a truth, than on the supposition that it is an unfounded claim. It says to the state and the human reason, "Ye are as gods," you are your own masters, and have no superior. The principle assumed in all the objections of anti-Catholics to the church, as far as half a century devoted to the study of the subject has enabled us to ascertain it, is this same satanic lie which denies the divine sovereignty, and asserts the independence of the human, whether social or individual, as we began by showing.

The real question between the church and her assailants, stripped of all its disguises and sophistries, is as to the divine sovereignty: Is God the proprietor and sovereign of the universe, and is his law supreme for all intelligent and moral agents? Yes, or no? If you say yes, your objections fall to the ground; if you say no, they equally fall to the ground; for then the mind and the state have no rights for papal infallibility to impugn. There can be no rights where there is no basis of right; and if the sovereignty of God is denied, there is no basis of rights of any sort. The universal dominion and sovereignty of God denied, how will you be able to assert loyalty as a duty, or the moral obligation of civil allegiance; or maintain that its violation is wrong or criminal? God's sovereignty denied, the authority of the state to bind the individual conscience, to exact obedience even as a civil duty, ceases; each individual is emancipated from all law, from all moral obligation, is free, if he chooses to lie, steal, rob, murder, without any power having the right to call him to an account; society is dissolved, and the moral order of the universe is a word without meaning. Follow out the principle of your objection to its logical consequences, and you will find that it denies all authority, all law, all right or wrong, the entire moral order of the universe; for all law, all morality, all right, all authority, rests on the universal dominion and sovereignty of God, since, as says the apostle St. Paul, *Non est potestas nisi a Deo.* The denial of the divine sovereignty is virtually the denial of God himself, is really atheism; and hence the horror with which mankind, in every age prior to our own, have regarded the atheist. Atheism denies all moral order and

leaves the world to be governed by mere force, or identifies right with might, as exemplified in Frederic the Great, Napoleon I., Count Cavour, Kaiser Wilhelm and his chancellor, Prince von Bismarck; as well as in the French revolution of '93, the expulsion from Spain of Queen Isabella in 1868, the insurrection of the mob and improvisation of the so-called government of defence in Paris, September 4, 1870, and the new reign of terror, instituted by the communists in the same city, March 18, 1871.

But reject the satanic denial of the divine sovereignty, and, consequently, the denial of man's dependence and subjection preached by the serpent to our first parents, and assert with all Jews, Christians, and Mahometans even, the universal dominion and sovereignty of God, and you must accept the law of God as supreme and universally obligatory. It binds both the state and the citizen, the community and the individual. It is the ground and measure of all right, and whatever is contrary to it is wrong, and forbidden to be either believed or done. Under this supreme law the state holds, and this law is the ground and limit of its authority, or of its rights and its obligations. This law is therefore the ground and limit of civil allegiance. The civil power holds all its authority from this supreme law, and, consequently, it has no authority to do or command any thing that it forbids, or that is contrary to it. Hence it follows that, if the civil power commands any thing contrary to the law of God, its commands do not bind the subject or citizen, are not only not obligatory, but are to be treated as null and void from the beginning, simply because the civil power has no right to issue them, and the law of God forbids them. Here is the limit of civil obedience, or my allegiance to the civil power. My obligation to obey ceases when the prince exceeds his authority, or violates the law under which he holds; if he commands me to do what the law of God—which is law for him as well as for me, and for me as well as for him—forbids, I am bound to refrain from obedience, let the consequences to me be what they may, for we must obey God rather than men.

But here comes up the question, How am I to know what the law of God prescribes or forbids? How am I to know where the authority of the civil power ends, and my duty of obedience to its commands ceases? Here comes in the church, professing to be authorized by God himself to declare the divine law. This is what every so-called church actually

professes; but how can the declaration of the church meet the demands of the case, protect the authority of the prince or state on the one hand, and the individual conscience, or the rights of the citizen, on the other, if, like all Protestant sects, she be fallible, or liable to err in defining what is or is not the divine law? The prince could not be sure of the extent or limit of his powers, nor the subject of the extent or limit of his civil allegiance. The prince or state might transcend his or its powers and play the tyrant, as we have seen done in England, and as is done every day before our very eyes in Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain; while, on the other hand, under the plea of conscience, the subject might refuse to yield the obedience the civil power has the right under the law of God to exact, and disobedience, sedition, conspiracies, insurrections, rebellions, and revolutions follow to distract the state, and endanger its very existence. The court to define and declare the law alike for prince and subject, for state and citizen, needs, therefore, to be infallible. How, then, pretend that papal infallibility, which declares without error, or the possibility of error, the law of God, is incompatible with civil allegiance or with mental freedom? A fallible court might be so, but an infallible court cannot be. Well, deny papal infallibility, and you have only a fallible court, no authority to define the law of God and declare what it prescribes and what it forbids.

Considering that the pope is the supreme governor and head of the church, and is the church herself in all her official relations with civil power, papal infallibility would be incompatible with civil allegiance, and mental and moral freedom, as Mr. Gladstone contends, for the pope might misinterpret the relations of the church with the civil power and human reason as fixed by the law of God, or vary from time to time in his definitions of them; but papal infallibility, since the pope does not make the law, but only declares it, is not only not incompatible with civil allegiance or with mental freedom, but is a sure guaranty that in no case can any thing be enjoined on the state or the individual, or forbidden to either, that is not enjoined or forbidden by the law of God, which neither has any right to disobey. Papal infallibility, therefore, protects, with all the authority of the church, both civil allegiance and mental and moral freedom. Dr. Döllinger, whom Mr. Gladstone and Prince von Bismarck so inconsiderately follow, suffers Satan to obscure and pervert his reason, in fact to deprive him of his senses, when he alleges that the

definition of papal infallibility by the fathers of the Vatican threatens danger to the civil power. The danger could be threatened only by a contrary definition. It is only papal fallibility or a fallible church that could be dangerous.

Some obscurity on this subject has arisen from the practice of theologians of treating the natural law and the revealed law as two distinct laws, not as two distinct parts of one and the same divine law. Thus the archbishop of Westminster, in his letter telegraphed to the *Herald*, says, or is made to say: "Civil obedience rests on natural law: revealed truth is the law of God. Society is founded in nature, and subjects are bound in all things which are lawful to obey their rulers." This is all very true, but it is neither definite nor exact, and leaves it to be inferred that the state does not hold, when society is not Christian, under the law of God; which is not true, and opens the door to the political atheism of our times, which no one more strenuously and effectively resists than the archbishop himself. The illustrious archbishop, who hardly has his equal in the church, could never have meant that the natural law is not the law of God, or that civil society does not hold from the law of God, because it "rests on natural law," and therefore on an authority independent of the divine sovereignty, or outside of the jurisdiction of the Holy See as the divinely appointed and commissioned interpreter of the law of God: for he knows, as St. Paul says, *Non est potestas nisi a Deo*, and that the church takes in her confessionals cognizance of offences against the natural law, no less than offences against the revealed law. So-called natural morality, of which a summary is given us by divine authority in the decalogue, is conformity to the natural law; and it would be something new to say the church takes cognizance only of offences against the revealed law, and not also of offences against the natural law.

Society is, no doubt, founded in nature, in natural generation, but it is subject to the moral law, the natural *moral* law, not to *physical* laws only, as the Emersons, the Huxleys, the Tyndalls, &c., foolishly and wickedly maintain in identifying the moral law, the *jus gentium* of the Roman jurists, with the law of gravitation, &c. Now, whence originates this moral law called the natural law, and to which even natural society is subject? Whose will does it express? Who is the legislator that enacts it? Nature? No, except by a figure of speech; for nature herself is bound by it. Nature

is the creature of God, and dependent on his will, and therefore has and can have no legislative power of its own, for we repeat from the apostle, *Non est potestas nisi a Deo*, there is no power (authority) but from God. Nature is not, and cannot give, the natural or moral law, and can at best be only the medium through which God, the universal sovereign and lawgiver, promulgates it. It is, therefore, as strictly and as veritably the law of God as the revealed law itself.

The practice of treating the natural law as distinct from the law of God has grown out of the neglect of theologians carefully to mark the important fact, which, so far as we are aware, none of them deny, that the natural and the supernatural are simply two distinct parts of one whole, not two separate and, in some respects, opposing systems. In some schools of theology the two orders are treated as two separate and unrelated orders: the one, under the natural law; and the other, under the revealed law. It may be convenient to treat them so, in our analytic or scholastic disquisitions, but they are not so separated and unrelated in reality. *Gratia supponit naturam*, and the supernatural order is only the complement or fulfilment of the natural. Each demands the other. Without the natural, the supernatural is a word without meaning, since, if there were no generation, there could be no regeneration or palingenesia; and without the supernatural the natural would have no end, no fulfilment, and would remain always inchoate, or a simple beginning. We do not say natural reason alone could recognize this fact: natural reason unenlightened by revelation, can go no further than the recognition of the fact that the natural is incomplete, insufficient for itself, and therefore has neither its first cause nor its final cause in itself. The rest depends on revelation, provable by ample historical testimony.

But, if there is any truth in what we have said, the natural and the supernatural are not two dialectically unrelated orders, or, as Calvinists and Jansenists hold, two antagonistic orders, but two parts of a dialectic whole. That is to say, the divine *schema* of creation includes, taken as it exists in the divine decree, the inchoate and its fulfilment, generation and regeneration, and glorification as the crown of the whole. The natural law is, then, only a distinct part of the one divine law, and is as much the law of God as is the revealed law itself. Grant, then, that the state holds from the natural law, it, nevertheless holds strictly from the law of God,

which is, as we have said, the ground and measure of its authority, and, therefore, the ground and measure of civil allegiance, as also of the so-called rights of the mind. The law of God can never be in contradiction with itself; and therefore, whenever the civil power commands any act to be done that contradicts the law of God, whether the natural law or the revealed, obedience is not obligatory, because it is commanded by no legitimate authority.

The whole Gladstone and Döllinger theory, on which is based the objection to papal infallibility, rests on the false assumption that nature is not under the law of God and that what holds from nature holds from an authority independent of that law. The objection assumes that natural morality, and politics, which is only a branch of ethics, are independent of the divine law; and therefore to attempt to subject them to that law is to deny their freedom; the rights of the mind in the case of morality; of the state and the civil order, in politics. But this assumption is atheistic, or, as we said more than twenty years ago of Gallicanism, at least Manichean. There is no morality, no politics, independent of the law of God, and there is no existence independent of the creative act of God. Hence their doctrine, that the rights of the civil power and the rights of the mind do not depend on the law of God, and therefore do not come within the jurisdiction of the church, is untenable, unchristian, as well as illogical, as Gallicanism always was. The pope has necessarily jurisdiction under the whole law of God, otherwise the church, of which he is the visible head, would not be catholic; therefore he has jurisdiction under the natural law no less than under the revealed, and declares it under either division, infallibly, if infallible, as declared by the Council of the Vatican. This follows necessarily from the fact that the law of nature and the revealed law are not two laws, but two distinct, yet integral parts or sections of one and the same supreme law of God.

There can be no divided allegiance, no antagonism between obedience due to the pope and allegiance due to the civil power, for, if the pope is infallible, he declares as the law of God only what is the law of God; and no civil allegiance not enjoined by that law is or ever can be due the civil power, and that which is due under the divine law, the infallible pope cannot fail to enjoin upon all the faithful. There can therefore be no conflict unless the civil power, as in Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain exacts an obedi-

ence not its due, and violates by its acts of tyranny the law of God. Papal infallibility is, therefore, dangerous only to tyranny which it resists with all the moral power at its command. Civil rulers may despise moral power, and attempt with their armed legions to ride roughshod over it; but with only transient success, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. The archbishop of Westminster's assertion that subjects are bound to obey their rulers in all things not unlawful, means in all things not forbidden by the law of God. This is the doctrine of the church in all ages. Subjects are bound to obey their rulers, therefore, for conscience' sake.

The *Herald* thinks the archbishop's reservation is that of the "Higher Law" of the abolitionists. Prudentius, in its own columns, has answered the *Herald;* and we have only to add that the abolitionists, in their doctrine of the "Higher Law," erred by appealing from the constitution, not to the law of God infallibly declared, but simply, as good Protestants, to the individual reason or private judgment, which is below, not above the civil power, and conceals the principle of modern revolutionism. The abolitionists also maintained that a senator, for instance, has the right to use the authority with which the constitution invests him, and which he has sworn to defend, in contravention of its positive injunctions, without resigning his seat in the senate. The fact is that the law of God is not, strictly speaking, a "higher law," for there is and can be no law that conflicts with it. Acts that contravene it are violences, not laws. The civil courts even refuse to enforce acts of the legislature that are contrary to natural justice, that is, contrary to the natural law; or did so refuse before the doctrine of the supremacy of the civil power came into vogue.

Prudentius has also set the *Herald* right in regard to its assertion, that faith is simply a sentiment; which is pure Beecherism. The *Herald* has latterly had some very able and statesmanlike editorials; but its indifferentism in matters of faith, and its lack of proper theological discipline, prevent it from being a safe guide in theological questions. A man is not necessarily a theologian because born of Catholic parents, or educated in a Catholic college.

Unhappily, what we call the age has lost sight of the spiritual or moral order of the universe. The scientists resolve the moral law into the physical laws of nature, and God the creator into mere force or blind energy. The

politicians emancipate the state from the divine law, and assert its freedom to do whatever it pleases, if able. The limit of its right is only in the limit of its might.

Thus far we had written, when we received the American reprint of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, with the replies of Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton. After reading the pamphlet, which strikes us as very weak and ill-tempered, we find on the main question nothing to alter in what we had written. Mr. Gladstone utterly fails either to prove that the church has forfeited her "proud boast of *semper eadem*" by the decrees of the Vatican, or that papal infallibility makes every Catholic a mental and moral slave, or is incompatible with the allegiance due to the civil power. He has only shown that some disclaimers of English Catholics during the struggle for emancipation are not in accordance with their present claims on the part of the church or the papacy; but this is nothing to the purpose, for these claims, as Lord Acton shows, were always made and known to be made by the popes, and never disclaimed by them. The Council of the Vatican has made no change in them, one way or another. The disclaimers of English Catholics, to conciliate the English government never were of any authority, for they were never confirmed by the pope, and they never deceived the English government which never trusted them, but imposed a special oath on Catholic members of parliament. Mr. Gladstone has no right to complain if he finds a change in the tone of some English Catholics, or finds them even insisting on claims which he persuaded himself were abandoned, since he knows, or ought to know, that, though the church may not at all times and under all circumstances exercise all her rights, yet she never abandons a claim she has once made and could not without denying her own infallibility. His real complaint is, not that the church has changed, but that she has not changed, and really remains, as she alleges, *semper eadem*.

Mr. Gladstone's charge is twofold: 1st, against the church universal; and 2d, against the Catholic subjects of Great Britain. To the first we have replied at length, and shown that an *infallible* church or an infallible papacy cannot, in the nature of the case, be hostile to civil allegiance, but enjoins obedience to rulers in all things not forbidden by the supreme law of God, which binds alike the prince and the subject, the state and the citizen. To the second, we have little to say, except that we are glad to find English Catho-

lics speaking out as Catholics, boldly in conformity with their Catholic principles, and no longer speaking as Gallicans, or subordinating their religion to their English prejudices. No good ever came from the Butler policy of trimming, or attempting to explain away certain features of the church foolishly objected to. We never had any sympathy with that policy. We have little respect for the Catholic who lacks the courage of his principles. Archbishop Manning's influence is great and thoroughly Catholic. He knows not what it is to trim. We are glad to hear, and we hope it is true, that he sent not long since a circular to all his clergy, to be read from the pulpit, declaring, which is true, that no one who denies the papal infallibility, as defined by the Council of the Vatican, is a Catholic. It is time to end the senseless babble about ultramontanes. All Catholics are ultramontanes, and anybody who is not is not a Catholic, let him call himself what he will. Mr. Gladstone, if he believed in the sovereignty of God, would see the weakness and absurdity of his pamphlet. There is no obedience due to the civil forbidden by the divine law.

NEWMAN'S REPLY TO GLADSTONE.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for April, 1875.]

We discussed as fully as we thought necessary, Mr. Gladstone's main charge, that papal infallibility, as defined by the Council of the Vatican, is incompatible with the civil allegiance of Catholics,—the only charge that affects us Catholics in this country. Dr. Newman, in the publication before us, has replied to Mr. Gladstone's expostulation *in extenso*, and has replied both as a Catholic and as an Englishman. We have no need to say that the reply is able and exhaustive, but, perhaps, its value is partially lessened by the fact that the author replies for himself, as an independent thinker, who writes on his own responsibility, from his own private and personal convictions, rather than as a doctor of the church, setting forth her doctrine. His convictions are, for

---

**A Letter addressed to his Grace the Duke of Norfolk, on the occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation.* By John Henry Newman, of the Oratory. New York: 1875.

the most part, coincident with the teachings of the church, but do not appear to rest on her authority. His reply, though, as a matter of fact, in the main satisfactory to Catholics, must be taken as the statement of the views of Dr. John Henry Newman by non-Catholics, rather than as the authentic teaching of the church, on the topics discussed; and therefore will not be taken by Protestants as any thing more than the answer, on his own hook, of a very learned, able, and distinguished individual.

A friend, in whose judgment we place great confidence, remarks to us that Dr. Newman does not appear to write in a thoroughly Catholic spirit; that even when his doctrine is orthodox, the *animus*, the spirit, is at least half-Anglican. Dr. Newman is decidedly an Englishman, with most of the characteristics of Englishmen. He seems to us to retain an affection for Anglicanism which we do not share; to believe it true and sound as far as it goes, and to have rejected it as defective rather than as false. His Catholicity, which we do not doubt is very genuine, is something added to his Anglicanism, not something diverse or essentially different from it. It is something more than Anglicanism, but not something different in kind. In fact, we detect no radical change in the habits of his mind effected by his conversion; and his republication of his works written and published when he was still an Anglican, with only very meagre notes, would seem to indicate that in his own judgment none did take place. Indeed he says expressly, somewhere in his "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," that "conversion is a putting on, not a putting off." In our case it was both,—a putting off of the old man, and a putting on of the new man; but then we were not an Anglican, nor one of the leaders of the "Oxford movement." There can be no question that Dr. Newman is not in full and hearty sympathy with his more earnest and enthusiastic brethren, and is far from falling in with them in their devotions to our Lady, for instance, who is for him, in those of his writings we have seen, simply St. Mary, as if she were only an ordinary saint.

Yet we believe much of what seems to us defective in his Catholic sympathy is due to his English reserve and not to any want of Catholic faith or devotion; to his English dread of overdoing, and appearing too demonstrative. He certainly did not sympathize with the Vatican decrees of the supremacy and infallibility of the pope; he seems to have some

doubts if they have the authority of an œcumenical council, because a large minority of the fathers refrained from voting, though not voting against them, and he seems to think these decrees tend to lessen the papal dignity; yet he tells us he believes both the papal infallibility and supremacy, and did believe them before the Vatican decrees. He, evidently, has also wished to present his statement of the points of Catholic doctrine, specially objected to by Mr. Gladstone, in terms as little offensive to his countrymen as possible, without betraying the truth; yet he defends the papal character of the church, and maintains that the pope holds, *jure divino*, the deposing power, or power in extreme cases, of which he is the judge, to depose a sovereign prince, and to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, than which nothing in Catholicity is more offensive to English Protestants. He questions the authority of the syllabus, but we have not found him countenancing any error it condemns, or includes as condemned. He says not a few things that will displease many Catholics, and some things which we cannot accept, but it will be difficult, we apprehend, to convict him of any utterance against faith. At any rate, whether his reply proves satisfactory to Catholics or not, it contains nothing, as far as we can judge, to afford aid or comfort to the enemies of the church.

The *Review* has never eulogized Dr. Newman, and it has criticised some of his publications with great severity, and incurred much odium for itself thereby. We have never liked his English reserve, and apparent want of frankness and fulness in acknowledging his errors and mistakes; he has always seemed to us to write as if he felt himself the leader of a great movement, which he had to take care not to commit by any word or deed of his. The present work is not in all respects satisfactory to us; it reserves a right, in extreme cases, to follow one's private judgment against the authority of the pope, which we dare not claim, and have no disposition to claim for ourselves, even in matters in which the pope does not claim infallibility; still, we like it better than any other of the author's publications that we have seen. Though conciliatory in spirit, and proving from first to last its author a loyal Englishman, it is bold, manly, independent, and unreserved in the expression of his honest convictions. It is, upon the whole, an able defence of Catholicity on the points assailed by Mr. Gladstone, and scatters the charges preferred in his expostulation to the four quar-

ters of the globe. He triumphantly refutes not only the main charge, which we ourselves refuted, but one after another all his minor charges, and proves, what every Catholic knows to be true, that a Catholic may be loyal to the civil power, and obedient to his prince or the state in all respects permitted by the law of God, and is in no respect a mental or a moral slave. Indeed, the Catholic is the only free man, and the only subject on whose loyalty the prince can always rely, because he obeys his prince for conscience' sake.

While we accept the reply as full and satisfactory in regard to Protestants, we are not quite satisfied with Dr. Newman's assertion that "the pope is the *heir* of the rights, powers, privileges, and prerogatives of the church of the fourth century." He maintains that all the rights, powers, privileges, and prerogatives claimed by the pope now or in mediæval times, were claimed and exercised by the church in the fourth century, but which, through default, the vicissitudes of nations, or the action of divine Providence, have all become centred in the bishop of Rome, who inherits them all, because all others have failed, and there is no rival or adverse claimant, so that Providence has rendered true the words of our Lord: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my church." This may be conclusive against Anglicans, but it strikes us as neither doctrinally nor historically correct. Our Lord gave himself the keys of the kingdom to Peter alone, not to all the apostles in common; and the church started as papal. The pope had in the beginning all the powers, privileges, and prerogatives he has now, if we may believe St. Cyprian, who, in his *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, maintains that for the manifestation of unity, though all the apostles were equals, one cathedra was established, that of Peter, whence unity of the episcopate should be seen to take its rise. They were his from the beginning, and his by divine appointment, not held in common with the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. These patriarchs were independent of the patriarch of the West, but not of the pope, or the chair of Peter. They held from the pope, and were answerable to him, who could judge and depose them. Besides, the patriarchates did not exist in the beginning, but were subsequently established or recognized by the apostolic see, as measures of administration; and that of Constantinople was not recognized by the pope, if we recollect aright, till the eighth or ninth century.

Dr. Döllinger, in his "Hippolytus und Kallistus," as also the Abbé Cruice, from data furnished by the newly discovered and published *Philosophoumena*, has proved that, in the decline of the second century and the beginning of the third, the popes claimed and exercised all the authority in the universal church they do now, and that the church was as decidedly papal in the second and third centuries as it was in the thirteenth or is in the nineteenth century. Dr. Newman has been misled, we say it with due deference, by his Anglican reading of history and by the theory of development. We regret that Dr. Newman retains a lingering affection for the theory of development, which he invented while yet an Anglican, as a facile way of getting over difficulties which he supposed, as an Anglican, exist in the way of accepting the Catholic Church; for his high character, great learning, and eminent ability are not unlikely to gain for it a credit it does not deserve, and which may do harm. We think a revision of his Anglican reading of church history, with a little more confidence in the learning and good faith of Catholic writers not converts from Anglicanism, would convince him that the difficulties Anglicans allege, are imaginary, and no theory of the sort to enable one to get over them is called for.

We are glad to see that Dr. Newman accepts as of divine right the pope's deposing power, which many Catholics deny. The able and learned Dr. S. Smith, in his essay on St. Gregory VII., is intent not so much on discussing the origin and ground of the power exercised by Gregory in deposing Henry IV. of Germany, as on showing Henry's unfitness to reign over a Catholic people, and that his deposition by the pope was in accordance with the *jus publicum* of the time, and the consent and demand of the German nation. He remarks, by the way, that in his view the pope held the power by divine right, as well as by the *jus publicum* of Europe at the time, and by the consent of kings and peoples. We think he will permit us to say, that he has not sufficiently distinguished the ground of the pope's right or power from the conditions of its efficient exercise. The pope holds the power as vicar of Christ, from God, not from man, kings, or peoples. St. Gregory professes to depose Henry by the authority of Almighty God, in the name of Saints Peter and Paul; and we are not at liberty to suppose either that he was ignorant of the title by which he held the power he was exercising, or that he misstated it.

In no instance does the pope, in deposing a sovereign prince, claim to act from any other than divine authority; and to assume to do it on any lower authority would, in our judgment, be monstrous, and decidedly revolutionary. The right or power is inherent in the spiritual order, and is inseparable from the divine sovereignty, of which the pope is the divinely appointed representative and guardian in the government of men and nations. This much is plainly asserted or implied in the dogmatic bull, *Unam Sanctam*, of Boniface VIII., and must be accepted if we recognize the pope at all as the chief of the Christian commonwealth, which includes princes or states as well as individuals.

Christianity is a creed to be believed, but it is also a law to be obeyed. As law, it is obligatory upon every individual in the Christian community, and binds alike all manner of persons, of whatever rank or condition, kings, princes, nobles, statesmen, men in authority, or vested with civil functions, as well as private individuals, for "with God there is no respect of persons," and no one is dispensed from obedience to his law. The pope, as the divinely appointed guardian and judge of this law, which includes both the natural law and the revealed law, since *gratia supponit naturam*, must have, *jure divino*, jurisdiction over the civil power, and the right to apply the law to men in authority or vested with civil functions as well as to any other persons, and subject them to the discipline he judges proper in the case. The right or power is divine, and held by the pope as vicar of Christ. But the pope cannot efficiently exercise this right except when and where faith is strong and fervid, when and where it is in accordance with the *jus publicum*, and is assented to by the people. The error of the excellent and learned M. Gosselin is in taking the necessary conditions of the effective exercise of the pope's power in the civil order for the origin and ground of the power, or of the right itself. As these conditions have for many centuries ceased to exist, there has prevailed among both Catholics and non-Catholics an opinion that the right itself no longer exists; that Rome has abandoned all claim to the power over kings and princes she once exercised. The right or power cannot be abandoned, any more than the papacy itself; but the pope can desist from asserting it when its effective exercise has ceased to be practicable. St. Peter had the power to declare the deposition of the Roman Cæsar, but what practical force would his declaration have

had? Pius IX. may declare the new German emperor deposed and his subjects absolved from their allegiance, but his declaration, except by a miracle or the direct interposition of God himself, would be of no avail; would be, practically, a mere *brutum fulmen*. There need be no fear of the papacy on account of this asserted deposing power, and Mr. Gladstone himself must know that in our times it cannot be exercised with effect, yet, if it could be so exercised, it would be a great benefit to civilization. We must here let Dr. Newman speak for us, or rather Pius IX. cited by him: —

"As if to answer Mr. Gladstone by anticipation, and to allay his fears, the pope made a declaration three years ago on the subject, which, strange to say, Mr. Gladstone quotes without perceiving that it tells against the very argument which he brings it to corroborate;—that is, except as the pope's *animus* goes. Doubtless he would wish to have the place in the political world which his predecessors had, because it was given to him by Providence, and is conducive to the highest interests of mankind; but he distinctly tells us that he has not got it, and cannot have it, till a time comes, of the prospect of which we are as good judges as he can be, and which we say cannot come, at least for centuries. He speaks of what is his highest political power, that of interposing in the quarrel between a prince and his subjects, and of declaring, upon appeal made to him from them, that the prince had or had not forfeited their allegiance. This power, most rarely exercised, and on very extraordinary occasions, and without any aid of infallibility in the exercise of it, any more than the civil power possesses that aid, it is not necessary for any Catholic to believe; and I suppose, comparatively speaking, few Catholics do believe it: to be honest, I must say, I do; that is, under the conditions which the pope himself lays down in the declaration to which I have referred, his answer to the address of the Academia. He speaks of his right 'to depose sovereigns, and release the people from the obligation of loyalty, a right which had undoubtedly sometimes been exercised in crucial circumstances;' and he says: 'This right (*diritto*) in those ages of faith,—(which discerned in the pope, what he is, that is to say, the supreme judge of Christianity, and recognized the advantages of his tribunal in the great contests of peoples and sovereigns)—was freely extended,—(aided indeed as a matter of duty by the public law (*diritto*) and by the common consent of peoples)—to the most important (*i più gravi*) interests of states and their rulers.' (*Guardian*, Nov. 11, 1874.

"Now let us observe how the pope restrains the exercise of this right. He calls it his right—that is, in the sense in which right in one party is correlative with duty in the other, so that, when the duty is not observed, the right cannot be brought into exercise; and this is precisely what he

goes on to intimate; for he lays down the conditions of that exercise. First it can only be exercised in rare and critical circumstances (*supreme circonstanze, i più gravi interessi*). Next, he refers to his being the supreme judge of Christianity, and to his decision as coming from a tribunal: his prerogative, then, is not a mere arbitrary power, but must be exercised by a process of law and a formal examination of the case, and in the presence and the hearing of the two parties interested in it. Also in this limitation is implied that the pope's definitive sentence involves an appeal to the supreme standard of right and wrong, the moral law, as its basis and rule, and must contain the definite reasons on which it decides in favor of the one party or the other. Thirdly, the exercise of this right is limited to the ages of faith; ages which, on the one hand, inscribed it among the provisions of the *jus publicum*, and on the other so fully recognized the benefits it conferred, as to be able to enforce it by the common consent of the peoples. These last words should be dwelt on: it is no consent which is merely local, as of one country, of Ireland or of Belgium, if that were possible; but a united consent of various nations of Europe, for instance, as a commonwealth, of which the pope was the head. Thirty years ago we heard much of the pope being made the head of an Italian confederation: no word came from England against such an arrangement. It was possible, because the members of it were all of one religion; and in like manner a European commonwealth would be reasonable, if Europe were of one religion. Lastly, the pope declares with indignation that a pope is not infallible in the exercise of this right; such a notion is an invention of the enemy; he calls it 'malicious'" (pp. 46, 48).

As we read the declaration of the supreme pontiff in reply to the address of the Academia, he asserts the right of the papacy, but confesses that in the present state of Christendom its exercise is impracticable: which is precisely what we ourselves have always maintained. Practically considered, the pope neither has nor claims to have the deposing power, and, in *this sense*, the first bishop of Pittsburgh was right when he said, in his controversy with us, that the claim is abandoned at Rome. It is abandoned, not as a right inherent in the papacy, as included in the supremacy of the pope, but as a power that as things now are, and are likely to be for a long time to come, cannot be practically exercised. This is Dr. Newman's view in answer to Mr. Gladstone, and ought to allay the apprehensions of all those who pretend the papal supremacy is incompatible with civil allegiance.

Dr. Newman is quite right in denying that the pope in exercising the deposing power is infallible. The pope is in-

fallible in teaching, but we do not understand that he claims to be infallible in governing. The pope cannot err as to the law, but he may err or make mistakes in its application to particular cases, where his only guide is human prudence. We accept, without any reservation, Dr. Newman's statement on this point:

"In saying this I am far from saying that popes are never in the wrong, and are never to be resisted, or that their excommunications always avail. I am not bound to defend the policy or the acts of particular popes, whether before or after the great revolt from their authority in the sixteenth century. There is no reason that I should contend, and I do not contend, for instance, that they at all times have understood our own people, our national character and resources, and our position in Europe; or that they have never suffered from bad counsellors or misinformation. I say this the more freely, because Urban VIII., about the year 1641 or 1642, blamed the policy of some popes of the preceding century in their dealings with our country *" (p. 43).

The decree of the Council of the Vatican defining papal infallibility affects the question of the relation of the papacy to the civil power only in one single respect. It simply forbids Catholics to deny that what, in the middle ages, was called the temporal power of the popes is held by divine right, for all the popes who exercised it claimed to exercise it in the name of God, as successors of Peter and vicars of Christ, and, if not infallible in its exercise, they are infallible in declaring the title by which they hold it, since that pertains to the domain of faith or doctrine. The definition of the papal infallibility adds nothing to the practical power of the pope, but it vindicates his right to exercise authority over kings and princes as over all other persons, and to apply to them the law of God, to require them to rule justly, to respect the rights of God, which include the rights of the subject and the so-called rights of man, and to depose them and absolve their subjects from their allegiance,

* "'When he was urged to excommunicate the kings of France and Sweden he made answer: We may declare them excommunicated, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth of England, and before him Clement VII., the king of England, Henry VIII., . . . but with what success? The whole world can tell. We yet bewail it with tears of blood. Wisdom does not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII., but Paul V., who in the beginning, being many times urged by the Spaniards to excommunicate James King of England never would consent to it.' (*State Paper Office*, Italy, 1641–1662.) *Vide* Mr. Simpson's very able and careful life of Campion, 1867, p. 371."

if they cannot otherwise be brought to respect the divine law in their government. The popes, we concede, do not possess the practical power, but what we contend is, that they do possess the right, and can no more abandon it or surrender it than they can the papacy itself.

The pope is not infallible in the government of the church, but he holds his authority by divine right, and his authority is supreme, and no one can disobey or refuse to obey any command of his without disobedience to God. That in the exercise of his extreme powers the pope has made mistakes, is possible; that he has made mistakes, we do not think we have any right to say. Authority judges; it is not judged. Dr. Newman goes further than we dare go. He is an Englishman, and obedience costs him something. He strikes us as somewhat stingy, if not in his actual obedience, at least in his avowals of his obligation to obey the sovereign pontiff, and takes care to reserve the right to disobey, when in his own private judgment he thinks he ought not to obey. We do not understand this reserve. The pope is the vicar of Christ, who has all power in heaven and earth from his Father; and when the pope commands, it is ours to obey without any reservation. If a true Catholic, all we need know is, that the alleged command is given by the pope, and what it really means. We must obey as if from God himself, as Abraham showed himself ready to offer up his son Isaac at the divine command. Man has no rights against God his creator, proprietor, and sovereign, and consequently none against the vicar of God.

The pope, however, is not even now without authority in temporals, hardly less than he had in the middle ages. His sentence of deposition against a sovereign prince would not now be executed, any more than it would have been under pagan Rome. Deposition was always an extreme measure, resorted to with extreme reluctance, and only after all other remedies were exhausted; and it has very seldom been resorted to at all, not more than once in a hundred years upon an average. But the pope, if he cannot now exercise that extreme power, can and does exercise his power as the supreme head of the whole body of the faithful. It is true he has no physical force at his command, and there is no nation that he can call upon to execute his orders; but he has a firmer support in the faith and conscience of Catholics, or the people of God. Catholics may disobey the commands of the pope, as they may disobey the commands of God, but

at the risk of their salvation; yet are they bound in conscience to obey him, morally bound by his prescriptions, and we are aware of no limits to this obligation.

Dr. Newman labors long and hard, while asserting the power of the pope, to show that the pope, as a matter of fact, rarely interferes in the affairs of the church, or makes his power felt, especially in temporal matters. Yet he ought to remember that all power in the church emanates from God through the pope, the centre and fountain of all ecclesiastical authority. The church is papal, founded on Peter, not episcopal, as Anglicans hold. There is no authority in the church that does not hold from the pope. I am bound to obey the pope, because, in obeying him, I am obeying God; and I am bound to obey my bishop or my parish priest, because, in obeying either, I am obeying the pope, the vicar of God. Separated from the pope or unauthorized by him, I am bound, nay, forbidden, to obey either. We therefore do not agree with Dr. Newman that it is only on rare occasions that the pope interferes and makes his authority felt in the government of the church or of Catholics; nor do we think it well to try to keep the pope as much in the background as possible. It may be good policy, so far as concerns those who are prejudiced against the papacy, but we think the effect is bad, so far as concerns the faithful themselves. Gallicanism could hardly have arisen if the true papal constitution and character of the church had been always brought out and fully insisted on. The apostasy of England, or, if you prefer, the loss of England to the church, was due in a great measure to the same cause. The English were never thoroughgoing papists. The pope was never for them the representative of the spiritual order. He was admitted, indeed, to be at the summit of the hierarchy, but not generally recognized as also at its base. The church by the English people was not regarded as founded on Peter, but on the episcopacy, and simply completed by the addition of the papacy. Hence an Englishman was capable of conceiving the suppression of the papacy, and the church as remaining in all its essential elements. Indeed we can, or at least imagine we can, trace the germ of Anglicanism in the church in England from the Norman conquest down. We hold it all-important, then, that the real power and office of the pope should be fully brought out and placed in the foreground. Thence it is we hail with so much joy and gratitude the Vatican decrees defining the supremacy and infallibility of

the pope. They bring out and place in an unmistakable light the essentially papal constitution and character of the church. *Papist* is a title of honor, and we glory in it.

Though the pope has not, in the present state of the world, of the nations which no longer constitute a Christian republic governed by Christian principles, the practical power to depose sovereigns, he retains in principle all his rights, and exercises, in teaching and governing Catholics, his full supremacy, the same as if all the world were Catholic. That his supremacy in its principle and the end for which he holds and exercises it is spiritual, is undeniable; but it is not true that its exercise has no temporal effects, and no bearing on the question of obedience to the state. We agree with Dr. Newman that the obedience I owe to the pope as the chief of my religion, does in no sense conflict with any duty I *owe* to the state; but this does not say that it never conflicts with any obedience the civil power from time to time does or may exact of me. We see the conflict of the two powers in some one country or another constantly occurring. There is this conflict now raging in Germany, and it raged most terribly in England from the reformation down nearly to our own times. England passed acts declaring the profession and practice of the Catholic religion high-treason, and then hanged Catholics as traitors. Germany passes acts which deny the rights and freedom of the church, and which no Catholic can obey, which the pope declares null, and forbids Catholics to obey; and many bishops and priests are now suffering imprisonment and exile, because they obey the pope rather than the state. Now, if you assume with that quibbling lawyer, Sir George Bowyer, that the state is independent in its order—and as nearly all statesmen and publicists assume—how can you maintain that the papal supremacy is in no respect incompatible with the allegiance Catholics owe to the civil power?

Dr. Newman does not, as we read him, meet this question fairly and squarely. Archbishop Manning meets it in principle, when he says, the subject "is bound to obey the civil government in all things not unlawful:" not forbidden by the law of God, we presume is meant. But this denies that civil allegiance is unlimited, and therefore denies the old heathen doctrine revived in the modern world, namely, the omnipotence of the state. The papal supremacy, as held by the Catholics, is *not* incompatible with civil allegiance when that allegiance is understood, with its proper limitations, as

subordinate to the law of God; but when understood to be omnipotent, as it is claimed to be by your Bismarcks, Gladstones, most Protestants, and all despots, it is to a certain extent at least, incompatible with obedience to the state, for it limits or restricts it.

These limitations imposed by the law of God, but which the political atheism of the age treats with contempt, the pope insists on being observed by Catholics. They are equally obligatory on all, for the law of God is universal; but they cannot be enforced on anti-Catholic legislatures, for the pope, as we have said, has no means of enforcing their observance and they are supported only by the faith and conscience of Catholics, and practically obeyed by Catholics only. There are numerous subjects over which the civil power claims jurisdiction, which belong to the jurisdiction of the church, or spiritual power. Marriage, for instance. On the subject of marriage and divorce, the legislation of the state and the laws of the church are frequently in conflict; and, besides, as marriage is always *res sacra*, and, under the Christian law, a sacrament, the church denies the right of the state to legislate on the question at all. The church holds marriage to be indissoluble save by death. A Catholic legislator can neither defend civil marriage, nor legislate in favor of divorce. He can do nothing against the laws of marriage, as defined by the church, either for himself or for others. The Catholic must follow his church, whatever laws respecting marriage the state may enact.

So of education. A system of education, which either admits no religion, or admits only a false religion, no Catholic can support. This is the reason why Catholics oppose our public schools. No doubt, much is said against these schools that is untrue or grossly exaggerated; and if the public were a Catholic public, and the Catholic religion made the basis of the education given them, they would be all that we could ask for our children. Where the people are all of one religion, common schools are practicable and desirable; but where a portion of the people are Catholics, and the rest are sectarians, and all have equal civil rights, they are impracticable, because either religion, the most essential part of all good education, must be excluded, or the rights of conscience and the equal rights of citizens be violated. We accept the principle of the public-school system, that the property of the commonwealth should educate the children of the commonwealth; but this is impracticable in *common*

schools in a community divided as ours is. The attempt to do it fails, and tends only to secularize thought, and to create religious indifferentism. The supervision of education belongs to the religious body, and the church cannot surrender it to the civil power, any more than she can marriage itself. Hence, as the church has no supervision of the public schools, and cannot teach her religion in them, she cannot permit Catholics, unless in exceptional cases, to send their children and wards to them.

Mr. Gladstone evidently holds that he owes his party defeat and loss of office and power to the adverse votes of the Catholic members of parliament on the Irish University bill, and we owe, we presume, to his defeat his savage onslaught upon the papacy, and his attempt to extinguish Catholicity in Great Britain. He considers the papal supremacy as incompatible with civil allegiance, because it has suffered Catholics to vote against his university bill, framed, in his judgment, in their educational interests. We do not agree with Dr. Newman, that the pope had nothing to do with Mr. Gladstone's defeat. He may not have personally and formally ordered the opposition, but the papacy defeated him, for the bishops, in opposing the bill, followed it and acted in accordance with its principles; and Catholics have no right to complain that the pope is held responsible as chief pastor, for their action, especially as he has not disclaimed it. But by what right does Mr. Gladstone assume that loyalty to the queen or the state required the Catholic Irish members of parliament, or the Catholic bishops of Ireland to support his Irish University bill? We can detect no breach of loyalty or of patriotism, in opposing a measure which promised no good either to religion or to politics. The measure was framed with rare unwisdom, and fitted to satisfy nobody. In framing it, Mr. Gladstone overlooked the fixed and immutable nature of religion, and went on the supposition that principles in religion may be compromised, as they are in the British constitution, which is no constitution at all, or a constitution with only one article, namely, the omnipotence of parliament. Parliament may do any thing but make a man a woman. Mr. Gladstone's bill showed that he had no conception of true religious liberty, and no disposition to secure freedom of education to Catholics; and we understand not why Catholic bishops had not as much right to oppose it as he had to introduce and urge it.

But the opposition of the Catholic prelates to the bill, urged on Catholic grounds, shows, not that the papacy is incompatible with the civil allegiance of Catholics, but, as we have said, that it is incompatible with many things statesmen claim on the score of civil allegiance. While the state, as under Protestantism or paganism, holds itself exempt from the law of God, or claims the right to interpret that law for itself, conflicts between the papacy and the civil power will arise, and, at bottom, of the same nature with that of the pope and emperor in the middle ages. The pope cannot now depose the emperor, but he can forbid Catholics to obey the emperor in any of his commands which require them to do wrong or to act against the law of God or their faith as Catholics, and they are bound to obey him at whatever peril, even to confiscation of goods, imprisonment, exile, or death. The pope governs the universal church, and governs as if the whole world were Catholic, though only Catholics are obedient subjects of his government. But then he governs according to the divine law. He enjoins that law, and forbids whatever is contrary to it.

There is nothing in this that disturbs the constitution of the state or the action of the civil law; only that Catholics simply refuse to obey the civil power when it commands them to disobey God. Catholics can suffer wrong from the unjust action of the state, as they have proved by their submission to the most cruel persecutions in all ages and nations; but they cannot do wrong at its command without forfeiting their Catholic character. We must obey God rather than men. Catholics are never seditious, rebels, or revolutionists. They will not obey a Nero when he commands them to do what the law of God forbids them to do, nor refrain at his order from doing what it commands them to do; but in all else they will cheerfully submit to his orders, and neither resist his power nor conspire against his authority and seek to overthrow his government. Indeed, this submission of Catholics to the "powers that be," though unmitigated tyrants as many of the pagan Cæsars were, is not seldom urged against Catholics as a reproach, as a proof of their tameness, want of spirit, and true manliness. Mr. Gladstone would have done better to have charged Catholics, not with the want, but with an excess, of loyalty. Nothing can exceed their submission to authority, or their devotion to the regularly established order. They are abused for this devotion, and much less opposition

would they meet if they were radicals, innovators, and revolutionists, seeking to turn the world upside-down, to throw all things into confusion, and make society a wild, weltering chaos.

In fact, it is this very respect, inspired by the church, of Catholics for authority and their indisposition to conspire against it, or to effect political and social reforms, or changes rather, by violence, that renders them so distasteful to the men of the world, and brings against the chief of our religion the charge of being hostile to "modern ideas" and "modern civilization." Modern society is revolutionary, holds "the sacred right of insurrection," and pretends that the people, or a disaffected portion of them, have not only the right to disobey the government, but to subvert it by violence, whenever they see proper; and that they are not guilty of any crime or wrong—unless they fail. It is only unsuccessful conspiracy, rebellion, or revolution, that is censurable, according to modern ideas; and hence it is that civil governments can sustain themselves only by armed force. The governments of Europe require five millions of bayonets to defend them against their own subjects. Not one of them governs by moral power, or could stand twenty-four hours, if it were not backed by the army. Yet the church is denounced as the enemy of society, and hostile to progress! How little do the Bismarcks, the Gladstones, and others of their stamp, understand that the refusal of Catholics to obey the civil power when it commands them to do wrong, but not when it commands them to suffer wrong, is the surest of all reliances for the free working and stability of civil government.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for October, 1875.]

This lecture on our public schools as they are now constituted, by the chief-justice of the supreme court of Arizona, is really one of the ablest, most direct, and most conclusive of the various lectures, articles, essays, or pamphlets, that we have seen on the great question it discusses, and which is the great question of the day, especially for Catholics in our country. It is plain, outspoken, and manly, and presents the question in its simple nakedness, divested of all disguises, free from all sophistry and logomachy, and argues the real issue with a lucidity and force that can hardly be surpassed, and which we have not seen equalled. No American citizen, who has any fairness of mind, or sense of right, can read it and not feel that the system of public schools as now worked in our country is a monstrous wrong to our Catholic population, whom it taxes for the maintenance of schools for the children of non-Catholics only, and from which their own children are, through fidelity to conscience, debarred from deriving any benefit. We have said, and we repeat, that we hear many declamations against the public schools with which we do not sympathize, and that much is ascribed to their practical workings which is not true, or, if true in any sense, is so only in exceptional and rare cases. The public schools are as moral, to say the least, as the average of our non-Catholic countrymen, and they cannot justly be called, as we have heard them called, nurseries of vice and immorality. We object to them because they do not make religion and morality the basis of education, and because they violate the rights of God and conscience, as well as the equality before the civil power of all religious beliefs or no-beliefs, guarantied by the American constitution. But they might easily, without in the slightest degree impairing their efficiency, be so modified and worked as to obviate all our objections, and to render the system equally acceptable to all classes of our citizens,

**Our Public Schools: Are they free for all, or are they not?* A Lecture delivered by Hon. Edmund F. Dunne, San Francisco: 1875.

and a public blessing. We Catholics, though in the minority, are American citizens, and have just as much right to have a voice in the organization of the public schools, and just as much right to have it listened to, as have any other class of American citizens.

The non-Catholic majority run away with the false notion that the country belongs to them, that they own it, and that Catholics residing here are trespassers on their property, or simple squatters on land they do not own, and lie at their mercy. Some of their representative journals warn us not to claim equality, not to presume to interfere in the public policy of the country, nor to attempt to exert any influence in the framing of its laws and institutions. They tell us that this is a Protestant country, and that Catholics must be content with simple toleration, and, if they ask for more, they will get less. This notion, or pretence of Protestants, is an entire mistake. They no more own the country than we do; it belongs to the whole American people, and all American citizens, whatever their religious beliefs or no religious beliefs, are politically and civilly equal, and have before the civil power equal rights, and equally a voice in making the laws, and determining the public institutions of the land. We are not here by Protestant tolerance, but by right,—a right as high and as sacred as that by which non-Catholics or Protestants themselves are here. They are the majority; they have the power, the might, and can oppress us if so disposed, but their might gives them no right to do so.

The welfare of the state depends on the virtue, morality, and intelligence of the people; and the virtue, morality, and intelligence of the people depend on religion. Without religion they have no basis, nothing to stand on, no guide, no sanction, no support, and are sure in the hour of trial to fall through, to fail utterly, as the history of the pagan nations of antiquity, as well as the common judgment of mankind in all ages and nations, amply proves. Education without religion only sharpens the intellect, and fits men to be adroit rogues and swindlers, as we are but too painfully experiencing in our own country, which bids fair, if a remedy be not soon supplied, to become a country of thieves, robbers, cheats, swindlers, and sharpers, if we may believe at all the daily reports of the journals. An honest man in office, in a place of honor and trust, is a *rara avis*. Well, the public schools do not and cannot teach religion, nor effectually even virtue and morality.

No doubt much may be and is done by Sunday schools and home influences to supply the defects of the public schools; but by no means enough. The influence of the Sunday school, under the best possible management, in a community where the religious instruction is so scanty, the moral tones so low, as with us, is very restricted; and where the people are so generally devoted to the worship of Mammon or to fashion, so thoroughly engrossed in business or worldly pleasures, home influences in favor of religion are very feeble, and the amount of religious instruction given, except in a comparatively few families, is hardly worth counting. "Evil communications corrupt good morals," and the general tone of the American people is, in fact, practically irreligious. Probably a majority of the American population have never been baptized, and it is only by a stretch of courtesy that Protestantism can be called a religion: for all religion is one and catholic, which Protestantism is not. The education given in the public schools can hardly rise above the average religion and morality of the majority; and those who regard that average as falling lamentably below the Christian standard, cannot be expected to be satisfied with it, or not to labor to raise by education their own children above it.

Chief Justice Dunne treats the question from beginning to end with rare practical sagacity, with a perfect comprehension of its legal and constitutional bearings, and with a vivid sense of justice. He evidently holds that, while the majority have the power, they are bound to exercise it justly, and that the majority have no more right than have the minority to do wrong. He believes that constitutions are mainly designed for the protection of individuals and minorities; and that the majority, under our form of government, are always able to protect themselves, and need restraints on their arbitrary will. He also holds that the constitutional guaranties of religious equality before the law were intended to guaranty that equality, and, so far as the civil power is concerned, to place all religious beliefs and no-beliefs on the same footing. This is, no doubt, true, as regards the intentions of the framers of our constitutions, state and federal. But, since the rise of the abolition fanaticism, which culminated in our late disastrous civil war, constitutions, when restricting the power of the majority, have been treated as so much waste paper. Constitutions which are simply written on paper, or engrossed on parch-

ment, and not embodied in the hearts and minds, and especially in the providential organization of the people of a nation, are as worthless, when they impose limitations on the power of the majority, as were the green withes with which the Philistines bound the stalwart limbs of Samson. We were as strongly opposed to negro slavery as was William Lloyd Garrison or Wendell Phillips; and if we opposed, as we did, the abolition agitation, it was not from love of slavery, but because we believed the destruction of the constitution a greater evil than that which it sought to redress. Chief Justice Dunne evidently believes in the inviolability of the constitution, and its binding nature on the majority; he also believes in the obligations of justice, and addresses the ruling majority in Arizona and elsewhere, as if it were sufficient to prove a measure unjust and unconstitutional to induce them to reject it. But the majority of our countrymen can be moved by no argument of this sort. They cast constitutions to the winds, and scout the very idea of justice to those who lack the power to enforce it. They act on the maxim, "The strong are always right; the weak are always wrong." They use fine phrases, and abound in generous professions and noble sentiments, while practising the most monstrous injustice; for a more monstrous injustice cannot be conceived than that of imposing a tax, and often a heavy tax, on the minority for the education of the children of the majority, and from which the children of the minority are excluded. There is nothing more outrageous, at least in principle, in Prince Bismarck's or Kaiser Wilhelm's treatment of Catholics in Germany.

It is no answer to this to say the schools are public, and as open to the minority as to the majority: for this is not true. The Catholic minority happen to have a conscience, which the advocates of these schools have not, and they cannot send their children to these schools without violating their Catholic conscience; and this fact closes them as effectually to us as if we were excluded from them by statute. The German bishops and priests, dispossessed, imprisoned, or exiled, are so only in obedience to their Catholic conscience. They could escape all persecution if they consented to violate their conscience, and submit to the infamous civil enactments made in contravention of the laws of God and of the church. It is barefaced mockery to tell us these schools are as free to us, the Catholic minority, as they are to the non-Catholic majority. It is no such thing, for they

have no conscience against them. The majority, as Chief Justice Dunne shows, impose upon us a triple tax. They tax us to provide for the education of the children of non-Catholics, in which we cannot share with a good conscience, and then compel us to erect school-houses, found and support schools at our own expense, often out of our poverty, for the education of our own children, and then tax these same school-houses and fixtures, while the public school-houses and fixtures are exempt from taxation. Can there be a more monstrous injustice? It needs only one step in addition, and that threatens to be soon taken, namely, to forbid us to have schools of our own, and to make attendance on the public schools compulsory. New York and New Jersey, and, perhaps, some other states, have already enacted laws making education compulsory, and it would be only carrying out the same policy to make it compulsory on us to send our children to the state, or the public, schools.

Mr. Henry Wilson, vice-president of the United States, and an honored and influential leader of the Republican party, published a few years since in the *Atlantic Monthly* a remarkable article headed, "The New Departure of the Republican Party," in which he proposed, as the policy of the party in the future, to place education under the control of the federal government, and to make it uniform throughout the Union, and compulsory. The proposition was taken up in congress, favorably entertained, and a committee was raised to which it was referred. Whether that committee, of which, if we recollect aright, one of the Hoars of Massachusetts was chairman, has made a report or not, we do not now recollect; but that a measure so manifestly unconstitutional, and so fraught with danger to the freedom of education and the rights of parents and guardians, as well as of the states, could have been seriously entertained for a moment by congress, shows but too clearly that abolitionism and the civil war have obscured the principles of what was once regarded as American freedom in the minds of representative Americans. What, perhaps, is still more alarming is, that we have heard no note of warning against the project from the usually vigilant opponents of the Republican party, and are therefore led to conclude that, on a question of this sort, Republicans and Democrats are united. Democrats and Republicans are not unlikely to be reconciled and made friends, as were Pilate and Herod, when Christ is to be crucified in the persons of Catholics.

There is a movement throughout the whole civilized world to banish religious instruction from the schools, and completely to secularize education, under the specious pretext of getting rid of superstition and the idle fears it generates. It began in the old French revolution, and was skilfully organized by the infamous convention that voted the death of the king, Louis XVI. With your genuine liberals, Christianity is simply superstition, and as such can be tolerated by no free and enlightened state, but is to be thoroughly uprooted and exterminated. The child at the earliest possible moment must be withdrawn from the priest and placed under enlightened, that is, infidel or heathen masters, who believe only in the earth, and surrounded by purely secular influences. The motive which operates with the majority in withholding justice from Catholics in this country is, unquestionably, consciously or unconsciously, the same that governed the French convention in its measures for secularizing education. As in France Protestants, Jansenists, and infidels joined together to the support of the convention against Catholics and the church, so do they unite in opposition to Catholics in supporting our public schools. The real motive for sustaining the system is the belief, that by it they may extirpate Catholic faith and worship from the land. It were fatuity, not charity, to think otherwise. Finding that we are withdrawing our children from the public schools, and establishing at our own expense schools of our own, they see clearly that they must fail in their calculations, unless they go further and forbid us to establish Catholic schools, and compel us to send our children to the public schools. This is the immediate danger. Can it be averted?

It can hardly be averted by human means alone, but, with a firm reliance on divine assistance, we think, if Catholics will but be true to themselves, it can be averted; and even the modifications of the public-school system as now worked, which we as Catholics demand, can be obtained. It is true, we are for the present in a comparatively small minority of the whole population of the country, but a small minority united and determined, and demanding only what is reasonable and just, who must sooner or later obtain success. The discouraging fact is, that the Catholic minority are not united on this school question, and do not act as "one man." They take different views of what is needed; many amongst us are cold or indifferent to the subject, and do

not enter heartily into the movement for obtaining our rights. Some are engrossed in business, not a few are absorbed in politics, place the interests of their party above the interests of their religion, and dare not move lest they forfeit their chance for some petty office for themselves or for their friends. Catholics in this country have never been accustomed to act in concert as one body, and do not readily unite and concentrate their forces for a given object. They are one in faith and worship, but have never yet been one in striving to obtain their rights in relation to the public schools. In fact, there is on this subject no unity of purpose, and no concert of action.

The first step to be taken is, of course, to effect the union of the entire body of Catholics throughout the country, and to induce them to waive their petty differences and local interests, and to look at the paramount interests of the whole body. A great wrong is done us as Catholics and citizens, and we must unite, combine, if you will, and act with an eye single to its redress. If we do this, and labor perseveringly with the earnestness and zeal the greatness of the end demands, we shall in time gain our rights, and induce the majority so to amend the public-school system, that all classes of citizens can cheerfully support it, and share in its benefits. We demand only our rights; we have no wish to interfere with the rights of others, or to destroy or to impair the efficiency of the public-school system properly worked. We accept cordially the essential principle of the system, that is, the support of public-schools for all the children of the land, at the public expense, or by a tax levied equally upon all citizens. We only ask that we may have the portion of the fund which we contribute, to use in the support of schools under our management, and in which we can teach our religion, and make it the basis of the education we give our own children.

Now let us Catholics, all Catholics throughout the Union, unite as one man in demanding this amendment to the system, and listen to no compromise, and give our suffrages to no party and to no candidate for any office that refuses to do us justice, as was some time since recommended by the venerable bishop of Cleveland in a pastoral address to his diocesans; and we feel sure the majority will ere long be forced to concede our demand. We thought at the time the recommendation of the illustrious bishop premature and injudicious, but we think so no longer. We were not duly

impressed with the monstrous injustice to Catholics of the public schools, as now managed, and their manifest violation of the religious equality professedly guarantied by the constitution of the Union and nearly all the states. We have been much enlightened on this point by the masterly lecture by Chief-Justice Dunne. We had always been averse to carrying any Catholic question to the polls, believing our members to be too few to be successful; but further inquiry has led us to believe that our numbers, though they do not in our judgment amount, as some of our friends pretend, to ten or twelve millions, are much larger than we had supposed. The great bulk of our Catholic electors are ranged on the side of the so-called Democratic party, and they form so large a portion of that party, that by simply withholding their votes from it, without giving them to the opposing party, they could throw it into a hopeless minority, and utterly defeat the success on which it now confidently counts. This gives us an advantage which was not apparent to us in the early part of 1873, when we expressed our doubts of the propriety of carrying the school question to the polls. Catholics in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and some other states, if not strong enough to secure the success of the Democratic party, are yet strong enough to ensure its defeat, if they choose to place the interest of their religion above their party interests, and withhold from it their suffrages. They can thus force the party to espouse their cause, and, if they accede to power, to grant us justice in regard to the public schools. Certain it is, as the parties now stand, the Democrats cannot accede to power as a national party without our votes, and it is our duty to let them know that our votes they cannot have unless they pledge themselves to use their power, if they obtain it, to repair the grievous wrong under which we now labor, and to maintain in the civil order the religious equality guarantied by the constitution.

The great difficulty is no doubt right here, in getting our Democratic Catholics to withhold their votes from the party, unless it agrees, if able, to do them justice on the school question. "Hic labor, hoc opus est," for Catholics have long been accustomed in their political action to follow the maxim, "My religion has nothing to do with my politics," and, without consciously or intentionally placing their politics above their religion, to proceed as if the interests of party were paramount to the interests of their church. But,

after all, this results from want of reflection rather than from any deliberate preference of the temporal to the eternal. When the question is once brought home to his understanding, and seen to be a question of conscience, no loyal Catholic will hesitate a moment to subordinate his politics to his religion, or refuse his support to any party that refuses to recognize and vindicate the religious equality of Catholics in the public schools, by giving them their share of them, and of the public funds which support them. In the religious aspect of the case, eternal interests are at stake, the welfare of immortal souls and of unborn generations is at stake : and we Catholics know that the stability, the virtue, the morality, and the intelligence of the republic, and the preservation of civil and religious liberty, are at stake ; for these depend on the religious, the Catholic, education of our children. Since Catholics are the salt of the earth, the church is the divine preservative force in every nation where she exists : no greater calamity could possibly befall our republic than her banishment from its territory. How, then, can any Catholic for a moment weigh the ephemeral triumph of a party in the balance against the interests of Catholic education ? He is a sorry Catholic, with just Catholicity enough to be damned as a Catholic, and not as a heretic or an infidel, who will do it.

The great question for us Catholics, and the great question even for our country, is the school question ; and the preservation of our children to the church, with their thorough Catholic education, is not less for the interest of the state than it is for the interest of religion. No state can stand without religion, and religion cannot be preserved in any state without the thorough religious training of each new generation as it appears on the stage. The Catholic Church alone is able to give a really religious education, and to train children up in the way they should go. This is one of her chief functions. The sects in reality have no religion, and can give no religious education, as the public schools amply prove. It is not the influence of Catholics that has made these schools practically godless. It is the influence of the unbelieving portion of the American people ; of those who reject all positive doctrines, and Christianity itself as a positive religion, or any thing more than a vague generality, or an indefinable abstraction. If we are debarred from establishing Catholic schools and from giving our children a Catholic education, no religious education will be given to

any portion of American children and youth; and debarred we shall be from establishing Catholic schools at our own expense, besides paying a heavy tax for the support of non-Catholic and godless schools, and compelled to send our children to the public schools, if we do not unite and make a vigorous and well-directed effort to prevent it.

This is a perfectly legitimate exercise of the elective franchise, for politics should always be made subservient to religion and morality. We combine and act politically, not to deprive others of their rights, or to acquire any control over them, but simply to obtain our own constitutional freedom, of which we are unjustly deprived by the political action of the non-Catholic majority. We have no wish to prescribe the education non-Catholics must give their children, nor to make a law for their government. If they are satisfied with the public schools as at present managed, why let them have them, and make the most of them; all we propose by political action is, if possible, to prevent them in future from taxing us to support them, or compelling us to send our own children to them. We are only proposing to secure for ourselves the liberty they claim for themselves to educate our children in our own way, without being taxed to pay for the education of their children. We do not seek to tax them to educate our children, we ask not one cent of them: we only ask the privilege, now denied us, of appropriating our own money, what we ourselves contribute, to schools under our own management, in which we can freely train up our own children in our own way. What demand can be more reasonable or just?

No doubt, a clamor will be raised against the church by bigots and anti-Catholic demagogues; she will be accused of interfering with politics, of grasping at power, seeking to remodel our institutions, and to destroy our republican freedom. A frightful hullabaloo, no doubt, will be set up from one end of the land to the other. But those clamorers would do well to remember that it is the non-Catholic majority, not the church, that has violated the constitution and republican freedom; and that we are only seeking to restore that freedom, and secure respect for the constitution. It does not become the thief to complain that he is wronged, outraged, when the owner of the goods he has stolen demands, in a legal and peaceful way, their restoration.

But knowing that we have right and justice on our side, as also the good of religion and of civil society, and that the

means we propose to use are legal, constitutional, and perfectly honorable, we must not suffer these clamors, which are false and injurious, to move us from our purpose, or to disturb our equanimity. Putting our trust in God, whose glory in the salvation of souls we seek, we must suffer no abuse to divert us, no flatteries to beguile us, no worldly interests to seduce us, no obstacles to discourage us, but move quietly and majestically forward, as becomes the servants of him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, to the end on which we have fixed our affections. We do not pretend that the struggle will be slight or brief, it will be severe and protracted: but the victory will be more than half-won, nay, will be assured, the moment we have got our whole Catholic population united and acting in concert to gain our rights, and make the civil equality of all religious denominations a truth. We may count with confidence on the blessing of the divine Head of the church: for we shall be engaged in his work, and laboring to promote the glory of his kingdom.

What we want is Catholic union and concert of action in the defence or promotion of Catholic interests,—a true earnest Catholic spirit, which the unity of our faith and worship ought to inspire and sustain. This at present is our great want. We have it not yet, but we are gradually approaching it, and the numerous "Catholic Unions" springing up in all parts of the country tend, or will tend, powerfully to realize it. We have only to remember that we are Catholics, and that, where there is no unity there is no catholicity:—"We know," says the blessed apostle whom Jesus loved, "that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren." The brethren are the whole household of faith; we must embrace and love all who are of the household of faith, without distinction of race or nation, condition or complexion; we must suffer no local interests, no narrow and unworthy prejudices of race or nation to divide us, and prevent us from regarding the interests of the whole body as those of each one of us individually, or from uniting as "one man" to promote them.

THE FAMILY, CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for October, 1875.]

Though bound as a volume, and very handsomely printed and done up, this is really only a small tract intended for gratuitous circulation among the people by the charitable and well-to-do. But, if of small dimensions, it is not of small importance. It treats in a worthy manner a great subject. The family, not the individual, is the social unit: indeed it is not only the basis of society, but society itself; and as is the family, so is society. If society is constituted by the family, the family is constituted by marriage, and marriage demands sanctity, unity, and indissolubility: three things which it lacked in the pagan world, and which it lacks also in the modern world, in proportion as the modern world ceases to be Catholic.

Social corruption, whether ancient or modern, begins in the family, and the corruption of the family carries with it the ruin of society, and of all that deserves the name of civilization. The renowned nations of antiquity went out with the family: it is to the restoration of the family, the assertion and maintenance of the sanctity, unity, and indissolubility of marriage by Christianity, that modern nations chiefly owe the moral greatness which they possess, or but lately possessed. The family received a fatal blow from the reformers in the sixteenth century, who began by denying the indissolubility of marriage, and soon proceeded to deny its sacramental character and, therefore, its sanctity. From a sacrament, therefore a religious institution, marriage, in all Protestant states, was early reduced to a mere civil contract; and consequently withdrawn from the authority of the church and placed under that of the civil power. No Protestant nation or sect holds marriage to be either a sacrament or indissoluble; and there is no one that does not permit polygamy, not simultaneous polygamy it may be, but actual polygamy, in permitting the divorced man or woman to marry while the husband or the wife from whom he or she is divorced, is still living. The reformers therefore de-

*_The Family._ By Rev. Auguste Riche, Priest of St. Sulpice. Translated from the French by Mrs. J. Sadlier. New York: 1875.

stroyed or prepared the way for the destruction alike of the sanctity, the unity, and the indissolubility of marriage, and placed marriage on the lowest plane on which it existed in the pagan nations. Hence we need not be surprised to find modern society, especially in non-Catholic nations, become, or rapidly becoming, as corrupt as it anciently was in the pagan empire.

M. l'Abbé Riche in this little tract shows us very well what this corruption of the family and of society was under paganism, and we commend his sketch of the family under paganism to our strong-minded women and our woman's rights men and advocates of divorce *ad libitum*, or so-called free-love. We make an extract:—

"In order to form to ourselves a just idea of the family before Christianity, it is always in Roman civilization, and at its best epoch, that we shall study it. Let us see, therefore, what marriage then was, and in what respective conditions father, mother, and child lived.

"There were at that period, in usage as well as in law, two sorts of marriages, the patrician and the plebeian marriage. Originally the former was almost always made by *confarreation;* that is to say, by a religious ceremony in which was offered *far*, or flour bread, which was intended to give to the union of the spouses a character of duration and stability. The latter, which was the more common, and became subsequently almost the only mode by which spouses were legally united, was the marriage by *coemption*, that is to say, a regular purchase. By this marriage the husband bought the wife, who, legally speaking, became his slave. She was sold by her father, or guardian, in presence of five witnesses. It is true that this sale was rather symbolical than real, since the price of the woman sold was only an *as*, one of the smallest Roman coins; but its effects were none the less positive, for the husband thereby acquired over his wife a complete right of ownership. In fact, he could abandon her as he had acquired her, and he had even the right to lend her, precisely like a piece of household furniture, the use of which one would give up for a time. With that power and those rights, the most moderate use the man could make of them was simply to repudiate his wife. But in that case she would not recover her liberty. She only returned to her father's tutelage or that of her nearest relation.

"As to slaves, we have elsewhere said that there was no marriage for them. Their union was not recognized, and, the legislator regarding it only as the transitory and fortuitous coupling of animals, the fruit thereof naturally reverted to the master of their person.

"It is easy to understand that marriage established on these bases offered no solid security to society for the propagation and maintenance of families; and, in fact, towards the latter times of the republic the citizens became so disgusted with it, and the population became thereby so

seriously imperilled, that a whole system of legislation was found necessary in order to encourage marriage and punish celibacy. Such was the origin of the *Pappian* laws, which held a considerable place in Roman legislation till the reform of morals introduced by Christianity rendered them useless.

"Another cause of the dissolution of the family in ancient times was divorce. In the thought of the legislators themselves marriage was only considered as an association which was to last so long as the parties agreed together. It was thought that where a good understanding no longer existed, there was no longer any possible companionship; and hence it was concluded that, to prevent this evil, it was requisite that a marriage which had become nothing more than a disunion, might be legally dissolved. These ideas had so prevailed that divorce and polygamy were universally authorized by legislation among the different nations of antiquity. The Indians, the Thracians, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, had admitted them into their moral code; and in the latter times of the republic and the empire the Romans had carried divorce to the most shameful lengths of immorality and corruption.

"Divorce must not be confounded with repudiation. The former was the dissolution of the patrician marriage, and the latter was that of the plebeian marriage. Divorce was an act between free persons equal in rights, and it might be demanded by one or the other of the parties. Repudiation was an act of master to slave, and it never came but from the master; that is to say, from the husband. Divorce recalled by its very name the independence of those who had a right to have recourse to it. It signified separation of the parties, who went each their own way in consequence of the incompatibility of their temper or of their habits. This separation had to be established and perfected in a manner as authentic as the marriage itself. Hence the intervention of the ministers of religion was again necessary, because they alone could unbind what they had bound together, and that *confarreation* had to be destroyed by *diffarreation*. As to the marriage by coemption, which was that of the great majority, its annulment was extremely simple. Concluded in the form of a sale, it was nullified by a sale, or, rather, by a purchase. The wife had been, as the jurisconsults said, *mancipated;* that is to say, bought by her father or her guardian. He who had bought her—her husband—*mancipated* her in turn as a slave whom he no longer wanted. Only it was those who had first sold her who bought her back; or, to speak more exactly, she was given back to them as she had been purchased—by a sham sale.

"Divorce was a serious act, and it necessarily had, in the limits of the law, an irrevocable character. But it was not so with repudiation. In that case it was a master who did what he would with his slave. He took her, he left her, and no one had a right to call him to account for his caprices. For the rest, incompatibility of temper and barrenness were, with adultery, the principal causes of repudiation and of

divorce, or, at least, they were those that were formally pleaded in such separations.

"So much being said, it must be remarked that divorce no more than repudiation prevented a wife from marrying again as soon as she wished. When morals had reached the last degree of corruption, this right was so abused that separations appeared as an inevitable and quite natural consequence of marriage. Under the reign of the emperors there were many women of the first families of Rome who might, so to say, have counted their years, not by the number of the consuls, but by that of their husbands. It had come to the point that wives had also acquired the right of divorcing, even in the absence of their husbands; and it happened to more than one husband, on returning home after a long journey, to find in his house only the wife of another. Evidently, as Martial observed, the woman who married so many times and so easily was not married: she was an adulteress by law. That which set the plebeians, moreover, quite at their ease in this regard, was the conduct of the patricians and of the emperors themselves. When Augustus, for example, was seen to put away his first wife, to take from Tiberius Nero his wife, who was on the point of becoming a mother; when men like Mæcenas, Cicero, and other grave personages, were subsequently seen to act in this manner with the same facility, people thought themselves sufficiently authorized to walk in their footsteps. Hence the slightest motives really sufficed to bring about a separation between spouses. Advanced age, some slight illness, a passing infirmity, or simple satiety, was enough to cause a divorce or repudiation. Now, with such principles and such monstrous abuses, it is easy to infer to what degree of depravity morals must have fallen. There was no more marriage, and consequently no more family. It was a universal debauch."

The abbé is very correct in his statements and just in his reflections, but he is not very profound, and, like not a few French abbés, not remarkable for his breadth of mind. The religious or patrician marriage, and which was forbidden to the plebs or plebeians, was doubtless a reminiscence of the patriarchal marriage, though much disfigured. The authority of the *pater familias*, among the Romans, over his wife, children, and slaves, differed not essentially from the authority of the Biblical patriarchs; and even Jacob purchased his wives, serving their father Laban seven years for Lia, and another seven years for Rachel. The authority was legitimate and unobjectionable, as long as it was tempered by conjugal and parental affection. The abbé, or his translator, would seem to confound the plebs with the populace, or the poorer and lower class. Niebuhr has corrected this very common notion. They were not seldom as noble as the patricians, and not seldom even richer, as the great Marian family proves. Nor

did the plebs complain because they were not permitted to intermarry with patrician families, as is commonly supposed. The struggle between the plebs and patricians, which at one time threatened to be so disastrous to the city, bore no resemblance to a struggle between the democracy and the aristocracy. There was a proletarian class in Rome, clamoring for bread and the circus, or shows, but no democratic class, from Romulus to Augustulus, that we have ever been able to discover. The plebs were denizens of Rome, but owning or owned by no part of the sacred territory surveyed and marked by the god Terminus, to which all political power in the city was attached; they had no voice in public affairs, though forced to bear their share and often more than their share in the public burdens. They complained of this, and also that they were denied the rites of religious marriage, or marriage by *confarreation*. That marriage by *coemption* became very general under the emperors is, perhaps, owing to the almost total extinction of the old patrician families. If we recollect our history aright, they were reduced from the three hundred families under the kings to fifty under Augustus.

We do not think the authority of the *pater familias* was productive of evil in the beginning, for women and children as well as servants, need a master: and, indeed, Christianity makes the man the head of the woman, and imposes only moral restrictions on his power. The abbé could have known little of the United States, especially in the northern, western, and middle states, where parental and marital authority has, except with a few old-fashioned people, hardly any existence. The evil of the patriarchal system began with the apostasy from the patriarchal religion. As long as men worshipped God and observed his law, the moral and religious restraints, together with a tender and loving disposition always nurtured by true religion, afforded ample protection for the wife, the children, and the servants; far more ample than the civil law now affords, if we may believe the reports of criminal and police courts. But when men apostatized, fell into barbarism, became a prey to selfishness, cruelty, and luxury, the parental and marital authority, as every other species of authority, was more or less grossly abused, for with religion went the sanctity, unity, and indissolubility of marriage.

We extract also what the learned abbé says of the "Condition of the Woman in the Pagan Family":

"What we have hitherto said of the state of the woman in marriage

may already give us an idea of her abasement and degradation; but all is not yet told. I know not whether it is to be attributed to the primitive traditions, which blamed the woman as the cause of the original fall; but certain it is that pagan antiquity never considered woman as the equal of man, and that it even placed her in a degree of inferiority that is only explained by a deeply-rooted contempt. 'The souls of men shall be punished in the second generation by passing into the body of a woman,' said Plato, and in the third by passing into that of a brute.'

"According to these ideas it is not surprising to find woman everywhere and always under the tutelage of man. Before her marriage, in the family, she was the property of her father, and consequently under a tutelage which no majority destroyed; and after her marriage that tutelage continued without anywise changing her dependence. In fact, whether she was married, as a patrician, by confarreation, taking the title of matron, and then she was freed personally from her husband only by remaining under the tutelage of her father or grandfather; or she became subject to her husband, and then it was the latter who became not only her tutor or guardian, but her absolute master. The wife had, however, the title of *mother of family*, even when she had no children; but that title merely signified that she was the mother of the slaves of the house. In fact as in law, she was never mistress of herself. In relation to her husband she had only the rank of a daughter, and when she became a mother it was only to remain the sister, *consanguinea*, of her own children. For the rest, in one case as in the other, she was deprived of the right of property, or at least possessed it only in the way of a child; for her goods were always under the guardianship of her husband or her father.

"This inexorable subjection of the woman to the man ceased not even at the death of the husband. Before his death the latter had a right to give his wife a tutor of his own choice; and when he did not do so the widow fell back again, quite naturally, under the guardianship of her father or her nearest male relative, as before her marriage.

"It is needless to add that, with such usages and under such legislation, the mother had no authority over her own children. We have already said that she shared all their dependence, in relation to those under whose guardianship she lived, and consequently all right was denied her.

"In fine, the woman passed her whole life in the slavery of man. The property of her father before her marriage, the property of her husband after her marriage, she became again, in her widowhood, the property of her nearest relative, or of a tutor chosen by her husband; that is to say, she passed from hand to hand, like any other property, and she could belong to all without ever belonging to herself.

"In this state of personal abasement, it is easy to understand that the wife would seek some desperate indemnity; and as she found no other compensation within her reach than that of sensual pleasure, it was not

surprising that she should rush into it with avidity. This was precisely what happened. Luxury when it was possible, refinement in all voluptuousness,—these became the grand business of life with the woman of civilized antiquity. And, as voluptuousness is selfish, even to cruelty, it came to pass that the woman, the slave of her husband or her tutor, took a cruel pleasure in exercising her tyranny over the slaves who were subject to her.

"Even at this period of effeminacy, of sensuality, and of luxury, in which we live, it is difficult to figure to ourselves how far excesses of this kind were carried in the world of pagan women. We shall not attempt to remove the veil of history that hides so much corruption. The heart heaves with disgust in presence of those revolting monstrosities. But how can we believe the voluptuousness of the pagan woman, her cruelty to her slaves, even on the testimony of the most reliable historians?

"In the time of the Roman republic a law had been passed forbidding women garments of divers colors, chariots, and games; but this law, *Oppia*, was obliged to yield to the ever-increasing demands of the matrons, and it was abolished twenty years after its promulgation. Then, as if to indemnify themselves, the women gave themselves up to the most frantic excesses of luxury. A free woman devoted her whole time to dress, banquets, and diversions; she had then a whole crowd of slaves to wait upon her. There were, especially, *cosmetists*, whose business it was to prepare and apply pastes, ointments, and perfumes of every kind, to hide natural defects and give some artificial beauty. Besides these there were *ornamenters*, whose functions were the arranging of their mistresses in their rich garments. Finally, the patrician lady had at her command a whole troop of slaves, whose duty it was to drive her chariot, to carry her, to follow and to precede her, and to run any and everywhere at the slightest sign of her will or her caprice.

"It was said proverbially that the Roman ladies were a year at their toilet. Hence they coquettishly admitted their friends during the labor of certain details of their toilet. Then woe to the giddy or awkward slaves who did not immediately comply with the wishes of their mistress! A prompt and terrible punishment instantly reminded them of all that was required of them. The patrician had no hesitation in flinging at their head whatever came to her hand. She even went so far as to throw herself upon them and strike them, pulling their hair and tearing their face with her nails. Some were seen to carry their fury still farther, for they armed themselves with long needles, wherewith they cruelly pricked their victims till the blood came. There were women who required that their slaves should wait on them naked to the waist, so as to chastise them the more easily. Many even carried cruelty so far as to have public executioners brought to their house to lash with whips and leathern thongs the body of these poor servants, whom they caused to be bound to a post or hung up by the hair; and that under their own eyes, and whilst they were having themselves scented with the most delicious per-

fumes. It was only when the executioner's strength began to fail, that the matron thought of putting an end to the torments of her victims. She then drove them from her presence.

"This is what was done in Rome under the emperors publicly, and without any one raising his voice to denounce such infamous conduct. It is the historians and satirists of the period who have transmitted them to us; but from the manner in which they relate them, it is easy to infer that they considered them only as mere exaggerations. Conscience had nothing to do in the matter, nor justice neither. It was a caprice that had passed into the usages of a people who had many others more monstrous.

"With all these refinements of luxury and of cruelty, woman found herself degraded so low that she strove to raise herself, exteriorly, by jewels of the greatest price. Patrician ladies were covered with gold; strings of emeralds and all sorts of precious stones and jewels hung from their neck, and were wound around their waist; their hands were loaded with rings enriched with precious stones; and on their arms, as well as their wrists, they wore golden bracelets fashioned like serpents, weighing as much as from six to ten Roman pounds.

"It was, nevertheless, in vain that woman sought to raise herself from her degradation. She was so despised by public opinion that debauchery itself had become disgusted with the refinement of her voluptuousness. Yes, she who was created to be the companion of man, was no longer thought worthy of being even the sport of his passions. And so it came to pass that man himself came to prostitute himself in her place to unnatural abominations, which were at length considered as nowise disgraceful, so common had they become."

The author sometimes mistakes effects for causes, but, in general, his account of the condition of the woman in the pagan family is correct, only we are inclined to think that he exaggerates this notion of property attached to the woman. Undoubtedly the law held her to be the property as a daughter, of her father, and as a wife, the property of her husband; but if not of the slave class, she was not properly the slave of either. Doubtless the civil law permitted the father to sell his daughter, and the husband to sell or lend his wife; but the sale of the daughter to a husband, the abbé himself says, was a sham sale, a legal fiction, and we do not find that the husband sold his wife as a chattel. We remember only one instance of a husband lending his wife to his friend, that of the elder Cato; and we do not find his act spoken of with commendation, or as one of frequent occurrence. We suppose the pagans had, till they reached the last stages of corruption, under the Cæsars, the ordinary affection for wife and children. We

believe the tyranny of man over woman in the pagan world has been very much exaggerated, as it is now under modern gentilism. Woman's tyranny over man is as great as his over her; and if he is the more brutal of the two, she understands better than he how to gamble on his love for her. We do not sympathize with the abbé in his talk about the independence of woman and her equality to man. She has all the moral and religious rights that he has, and is, morally and spiritually, his equal; but in the family she is subordinated to him as her head, as Christ is the head of the church. The abbé knows and concedes it, but he uses expressions which are too favorable to the woman's rights movement, as we have sometimes found the illustrious bishop of Orléans himself doing.

The real cause of the dissolution of the family under paganism was, first, the apostasy of the gentiles, their nationalism, their desertion of the worship of God, their impure and abominable superstitions, and gross idolatries; and second, the toleration of divorce and repudiation. The corruption of religion carries with it the corruption of every thing else, the family, the state, education, and natural society itself. Where purity of faith and worship is wanting, every species of moral purity is wanting. Man cannot live as a natural man alone, or, as the ancients said, "according to nature," for he is under a gracious providence, and must always either rise by grace above nature, or, by satanic influence, fall below it. If he worships not God, he worships the devil. The pagans gave up the worship of God, and worshipped the devil in his place:—"All the gods of the heathen are devils," the Scriptures tell us, and the great effort of the modern world, especially of the sects, is to rehabilitate them. The abbé, from the corruption of the pagan family and society, would prove the devilish character of the pagan religion, and, therefore, the moral necessity of Christianity. This is all well, and is, no doubt, a legitimate method of treating the question; but, for ourselves, we prefer a briefer and more comprehensive line of argument. The method we prefer is, to begin by showing that Christianity expresses the normal order of all the Creator's works, both natural and supernatural, and then to conclude at once that any deviation from the Christian law, either in faith or worship, is itself moral corruption. Even Catholics are too apt to forget that Christianity expresses the normal order of the universe; that man is created and exists for

the supernatural; that nature never suffices for nature, and that man has, in the present providence, no natural end, no natural beatitude; and that consequently all so-called natural virtues are imperfect, and require to be supplemented, completed, or transfigured by the supernatural.

No doubt the natural order is distinguishable from the Christian order, but only as the initial is distinguishable from the teleological,—the beginning from the end. Yet, the Christian order in its full sense comprehends both the natural and the supernatural, for all things have been created and are sustained *ad Christum* no less than *ad Verbum*. The Christian is the normal order of the universe, and no life is a true and well-ordered life that is not conformed to the Christian order, or the law of Christ. Hence the destructive nature of heresy, infidelity, and apostasy. Heresy mutilates the law, and transfers the authority, whose will the law expresses, from Christ, who is God, to man, and places it in the human will; for the word heresy means choice. The heretic is therefore one who chooses his own religion, and, of course, in obeying it obeys only himself, that is to say, performs no act of obedience at all. Hence the reason why we always find heretics, that is, sectarians, proud, arrogant, conceited, and overbearing, never truly gentle, meek, and humble. Humility is the root of every Christian virtue, and heresy and humility never go together. Infidel, with Catholic theologians, means an unbaptized person, one who has never received the faith in Christian baptism; but, with Protestant theologians, and generally in our English-speaking world, means one who denies the divinity of Christ, and all divine revelation. He may be a deist, a pantheist, or an atheist. Infidelity, therefore, in Christian communities, is coincident with apostasy. It is a total rejection of the Christian order, and, therefore, the normal order of the universe, and is to be marked as the enemy of God, and of all truth and goodness.

Heresy, which is a species of infidelity in our English sense, and does not in principle differ from it, has come, in nearly all modern societies, to be looked upon as blameless, if not as praiseworthy, since Christianity itself has come to be looked upon as a mere theory or a mere opinion, with no moral character of its own, obligatory, if at all, only on those who accept it. But this is a sad error, and is seen to be so, the moment the Christian order is understood to be, identically, the normal order of the universe, the moral law

of creation, without which nothing in creation has any reason of existence, any sense or meaning, or real life. Christ is the light, and the light is the life of the world. You cannot reject Catholicity and fall back on a generic Christianity, as the reformers dreamed they could; for, as separate or distinguished from the Catholic Church, there is no Christianity. You cannot reject Christianity and fall back on nature, for Christianity includes both the natural and the supernatural and their dialectic union, and nature demands it for its own significance and fulfilment.

The errors of Calvinists and Jansenists, who suppress nature in order to make way for grace, have doubtless led our theologians to place the greatest possible emphasis on the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, and to give the greatest prominence possible, without absolute error, to the natural. They have dwelt less on the fact that the natural and the supernatural form, in the divine decree, but one dialectic whole, are only parts of one universal order,—so as not to seem to favor the Calvinistic and Jansenistic heresy,—than might otherwise have been desirable. But we think that the synthesis of nature and grace, or the dialectic relation of the natural and the supernatural as parts of one uniform whole, may now be brought out without any danger of favoring that monstrous heresy; and it seems to us necessary to do it in order to meet the pernicious error of those who imagine that they can find a standing-place for reason and science outside of the Christian order,—the enemies we have now chiefly to war against; and against whom we have hitherto waged a less successful war than we might and should have done. We must prove to them that the Christian order is catholic, and intrinsic in the universe, and that outside of it, there is and can be no ground to stand on.

But to return from this digression, or from these necessary explanations rather. Once established that the Christian order is the normal order of the universe, we have no difficulty in proving that apostasy, or a departure from it, necessarily throws the apostate nations out of order, and plunges them into a moral chaos. The corruption of the pagan family and of pagan society resulted from the rejection of the Catholic religion represented by the patriarchs, and the adoption in its place of gentilism, or, as we say in modern times, nationalism and sectarism. The more immediate cause of the corruption of the family was not the

tyranny of the husband and father, nor the slavery of the wife and children, but the denial of the indissolubility and sanctity of marriage. These things followed as the effects of that denial. The corruption followed as a necessary consequence of the rejection of marriage as founded in the Christian order, that is, as founded in the order of nature and grace; and we see the same consequences follow in the modern nations that make marriage a civil contract, and dissoluble, with permission to the parties divorced to marry again. These nations destroy the sanctity, the unity, and the indissolubility of marriage, therefore the Christian family itself as established in the Christian order. The corruption of general society follows as a necessary consequence of the dissolution of the family.

We extract here what the author says of the position of the child under paganism:—

"By the condition of the woman in the pagan family it is easy to imagine what must have been the fate of the child. It was another slave, over whom the head of the family exercised the right of full ownership.

"In Rome, in the best days of her civilization, every child immediately after its birth was laid on the ground at its father's feet. If the latter took it up, it was understood that he recognized it and consented to preserve its life. But if, on the contrary, he left it at his feet, it was understood that he abandoned it. They then took it and left it exposed in some public place, without troubling themselves any more about it. Thus deserted, the unfortunate creature had little chance of any other fate than to die of cold or hunger, or be devoured by dogs. Its lot was sometimes worse still, for enterprising beggars had a right to take possession of it and mutilate it, in order to obtain alms from public commiseration.

"In the best conditions of family life the child so remained the property of his father, that the latter was nowise accountable to the law for the use he made of him. In fact, the paternal right which Romulus had rendered common to the patricians and plebeians, permitted fathers to put their children into prison, to have them beaten with rods, to load them with irons, to send them to the country to till the soil, to sell them as slaves, and also to have them put to death, even though they had occupied the very highest positions, and had rendered the most signal services to the republic.

"We may add that this absolute power of the father over his child was not exclusively proper to the Romans. It was admitted in the legislation of all nations; and it was barely a few philosophers who gave utterance to some equivocal protests, which no one heeded in the affairs of life. 'As to the Roman legislators in particular,' says Sextus Empiricus, 'they had rendered the condition of children absolutely like to

that of the slaves; and fathers were masters of their goods, until they had emancipated them, in the same way that they emancipated their slaves.'

"In the time of the emperors, it is true, the rigor of the ancient legislation was softened by some laws restrictive of parental authority; but these new laws were rather an appeal to paternal pity than a real repression, since they were ratified by no fixed penalty. To magistrates only did it belong to pronounce on grave crimes; but as there was here question of an abuse of power tolerated by past ages, and which was still found in accordance with the ideas of the time, people easily shut their eyes: and so it was that paternal authority might become with impunity the most cruel of tyrannies.

"Even under the sway of the most beneficent laws in favor of children, the father had still the right to sell his new-born child in a case of necessity, of which he was the principal judge; and, if he found no purchaser, there was nothing to prevent him from getting rid of it by exposing it in some lonely place.

"What adds still more to the despotism of this abuse of paternal authority is the extension the law gave as to the persons who were subject to it. In fact, this authority extended not only to all the children born of an actual marriage, together with adopted children and wards, but it applied also to the children or grandchildren who were born of the marriage of sons or grandsons. It reached even to daughters-in-law, married or emancipated, who thus became, as it were, the daughters of their husbands, and thereby remained, so to say, the granddaughters of their fathers-in-law. The law could not recognize the authority of a son in a family over his wife and children, because, it is said, he should be master over himself to exercise power over another; and that he was not.

"In short, the pagan marriage was, therefore, only a union by which the woman passed into the tutelage of a husband when she did not remain under that of her father. With the full liberty of divorce, this union had no other security for stability than the caprice of the married couple. Thence came a fearful corruption of morals, and trouble and confusion in families. In these conditions, established or tolerated by the laws, the woman and the child were veritable slaves, subject, body and goods, to the despotism of the husband or father. In a word, women and children were, as slaves, the free property of a master; and the latter, husband or father as he might be, could use and abuse them as he would the furniture of his house. Such was the family in antiquity, when Jesus Christ appeared on earth."

Under the patriarchal system, and even under the Jewish, the authority of the father over the child was in most respects as great as it was under paganism; but its exercise, as we have said in the case of the wife, was tempered, not only by natural affection, but by the teaching, the precepts, and

the discipline of the Catholic religion, which, we must remember, was held alike by the patriarchs and the synagogue. The faith of the patriarchs and of the Jews was the same with ours, only they believed in Christ who was to come, and we in Christ who has come. Catholic means universal in time as well as in space, and the Catholic religion was always and everywhere, and ever will be, the one only religion of the people of God: and God has always had a people on earth, and always will have to the end of time. The gentiles, when they broke away from unity, and became dispersed over the earth, carried with them many reminiscences of the patriarchal religion, and retained many of the provisions of primitive legislation, which, however, they retained only in a fragmentary state, and often and sadly abused. The authority of the father over the child under paganism was retained from the primitive legislation, and never annulled either by the synagogue or the church, though provisions restricting its exercise and guarding against its abuse were adopted in both.

Paganism had its point of departure in the true religion, in the primitive constitution of society and the primitive legislation, that is to say, in the patriarchal tradition, which it gradually perverted, corrupted, mutilated, and not unfrequently travestied, as Protestantism does the tradition of the church; only in several respects Protestantism retains less of Catholic principle than did paganism. Paganism retained nearly all the principles of the primitive tradition, but rejected, lost, or perverted its doctrines; Protestantism, in some of its forms, retains many of its doctrines, but rejects, loses, or perverts its principles. The principle of parental authority belonged to the patriarchal tradition, which was of divine origin; but paganism misapplied, perverted, or exaggerated it, the later developments of Protestantism tend to deny it, and one of the greatest evils of modern non-Catholic society is the lack of family government, the practical emancipation of the child from parental authority. It is necessary, therefore, as in the case of marital authority, in pointing out the perversions and abuses of parental authority under paganism, to take care not to attack or impair the principle itself, and thus destroy the very basis of filial respect and obedience.

The father among the Romans,—the most cruel people of which history gives us any account, and from whom were derived the barbarous and cruel practices of the barbarous

ages of modern society, commonly supposed to have been introduced by the Germanic conquerors of the empire,—had the power of life and death over the child, and if he refused to say to the new-born infant, "Live," it was exposed. This was bad enough; but while in modern society infants are no longer exposed, they are, to a fearful extent, murdered even before they are born, which is far worse. Fœticide is to us more shocking than infant exposure; nor less revolting is another practice that obtains to an alarming extent, which we name not. We think also that the undue license enjoyed by children in non-Catholic society in modern times is a greater social evil than the alleged tyranny of the father under ancient paganism. The Abbé Riche does not seem to be fully aware of the fearful corruption and degradation of the family in our modern non-Catholic communities. The corruption and degradation of the family have gone further than he supposes, and, if they are not as universal as under Greek and Roman paganism, they are as deep and damning in their more limited sphere.

It was with great difficulty the church succeeded in bringing society practically up to the observance of Christian marriage, on which the family depends; and it is sad to think that for over three hundred years it has been warred against in one form or another by all the enemies of Catholicity,—let us say in plain words, by all the enemies of the papacy. The Protestant reformation denied its sacramental character, made it a civil contract, and dissoluble as any other civil contract by the civil authority on conditions prescribed by itself. It thus denied its sanctity, that it is *semper res sacra*,—always a sacred thing, as Père Martin maintains, denied its indissolubility, and by authorizing not only divorce, but the husband or wife divorced to marry again during the lifetime of the other party, it practically denied its unity, and authorized what the Abbé Riche calls "successive polygamy," not different in principle from the simultaneous polygamy as practised by the Mormons, and which, indeed, Luther and the leading Protestant ministers sanctioned, at least, in the case of Philip, landgrave of Hesse.

At first Protestants allowed divorce only in the case of adultery, and permitted only the innocent party to marry again during the lifetime of the other party; but other causes, as time went on, such as desertion, cruelty, incompatibility of temper, &c., were added, and deemed sufficient

for dissolving the marriage bond; and in most Protestant states both parties, the guilty as well as the innocent, are now allowed to form new marriage relations. In some of the states of our American Union divorce is almost *ad libitum*, and really for no other reason than that the parties, one or both of them, wish to form a new partnership. The church allows a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, for adultery, desertion, and extreme cruelty, but divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* never; and in no case is either party free to marry while the other is living. Our Lord allows the separation from bed and board, but does not free the parties from the marriage bond, and neither party can marry another without committing adultery. So we read in the New Testament; but Protestants, though professing, in season and out of season, to take the Bible as their rule of faith and practice, hold it of no more authority than last year's almanac, unless it supports their opinions or favors their inclinations. The more advanced party among them admit no matrimonial bond in any proper sense at all, but contend that the parties should be free to come together and to separate according to their mutual pleasure or convenience. The women's rights movement inaugurated by Mary Wollstonecraft, after some sad experiments in free-love, married to William Godwin, was and is with its leaders a movement against the laws of Christian marriage, and therefore against the family. The demand for woman suffrage has for its object the abolition of all marriage laws, and there is no logical standing between divorce *a vinculo*, as asserted by all Protestants, and what goes by the name of free-love. We know no class of professed reformers who do not make war directly or indirectly on Christian marriage, and consequently on the family, and therefore on society itself.

The demand for divorce *a vinculo*, which logically involves divorce *ad libitum*, is based on the assumption that the sole object of marriage, or cohabitation of the man and woman, is the mutual happiness or pleasure of the cohabiting couple, and that, when it ceases to effect that object, it should be dissolved, and each party be free to choose a new partner. There is in it no thought of the child. But the family consists of the husband, the wife, and the child; and the chief object of Christian marriage is the procreation and proper rearing of children, which is paramount to the mutual happiness or pleasure of the parents. This end is overlooked; and the duties of the parent to the child are

impracticable, and cannot be properly discharged without the permanence of the family. We all know the sad calamity it is to the children when the Christian father or Christian mother is taken from them by death while they are yet young; and the still more distressing calamity when both are removed, and the children are made complete orphans and thrown on the care of strangers. Yet the separation by divorce *a vinculo* of the parents is a greater calamity still, and leaves the children worse off than simple orphans. Divorce breaks up the family as effectually as death; and parents separated by divorce are as incapable of bringing up their children as if they were actually dead.

The advocates of free-love are aware of this, and consequently contemplate measures, which will either prevent children from being born, or, if by some mischance they happen to be born, that will relieve the parents of all care of them:—the state must provide nurses for them, and provide for their bringing up and maintenance till they are able to do for themselves, somewhat on the plan recommended by Plato in his "Republic." Our women's rights women complain bitterly of the burden of childbearing, and of the woman's being obliged to spend the best years of her life in the drudgery of household cares, and of bringing up a whole brood of children. It is masculine tyranny that dooms her to it, from which woman suffrage and eligibility would soon emancipate her. They forget that it was to this she was doomed by a higher Power than that of man. It is the original penalty pronounced upon her for suffering herself to be seduced by the serpent, and for seducing her husband. In vain does she struggle against the irreversible laws of God:—"To the woman he said, I will multiply thy sorrows, and thy conceptions; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children, and thou shalt be under thy husband's power, and he shall have dominion over thee."

The evil of the doctrine that the marriage tie is dissoluble, does not end here. The admitted fact that it is dissoluble, has a very deleterious effect on both parents and children even when no actual dissolution takes place. Knowing that the marriage may be dissolved, that it is not necessarily for life, the husband and wife are indisposed to make the best of an ill-assorted marriage, and refuse to make those mutual concessions to each other's infirmities of temper, so necessary to a harmonious union between them. They are rather disposed to exaggerate them into causes of real alienation. Each

becomes more irritated at the other, and petty faults, which should be overlooked or forgotten as soon as committed, are magnified by being brooded over, into unpardonable offences, and the marriage becomes a source of constant irritation, discord, and wretchedness; whereas, if from the first it had been understood and felt that the union is absolutely indissoluble save by death, the parties would have studied to adjust themselves to each other, to cultivate habits of mutual forbearance, and taken care not to magnify, nor to dwell on such little disagreements as may, and are almost certain from time to time to arise between parties not perfect or free from human passion and frailty. The wife yields to the husband without a murmur, even when he is unreasonably exacting; and the husband shows himself indulgent, even to the whims and caprices of his wife. So the union is made the best of, the mutual forbearance ripens into mutual love, and makes the parties, both for their own sake and the sake of their children, dread nothing so much as a separation.

But the discord between the parents, the lack of mutual respect of husband and wife, which we encounter in most non-Catholic families when we are permitted to see behind the curtain, and which is greater in proportion to the facility with which divorces can be obtained, has a terrible effect in destroying filial respect, filial love, and filial obedience. Children are keen-sighted; and the father cannot fail to honor the wife and the mother, or the wife and the mother to respect and obey the husband and the father, without their seeing it. "Young America" is, in great measure, the offspring of American democracy, which asserts the largest liberty, and renders strict family government, as well as efficient civil government, impracticable. "Is not this a free country?" said a boy some dozen years old to his father who had just flogged him. "Yes, young saucebox." "Then by what right do you flog me?" This spirit of license and insubordination penetrates the family, infests the whole community, infects the very atmosphere we breathe, and shows itself in the children of foreign parents brought up here not less, and, perhaps, in some instances, even more than in the children of those who are "to the manner born." It is to this same spirit, the democratic spirit of the country, and even of the age, that we must ascribe the degradation of the family, and the tendency to deprive marriage of its sacramental character, to facilitate divorces, and to favor

free-love. Divorce reacts on the children, and destroys to a fearful extent, their love and reverence for their parents. The insubordination of the wife shows itself in the insubordination of the child, and the insubordination of children to their parents produces insubordination to law,—disrespect and disobedience alike to the spiritual and civil chiefs of society. There is no country in the world where the natural results and logical tendencies of all the false notions and theories of the age, which the world owes to the modern apostasy from the Catholic Church, can be so advantageously studied as in our own. This is because these tendencies are less restrained here than elsewhere, and are freer to run their natural course and reach their natural results. But it is not in the more aristocratic sects, like the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, and perhaps the Methodist, who pertain in part to the past, but in the plebeian, subterranean, and out-of-the-way sects. Familiarity with these sects enables one to see,—what at first sight is not apparent,—that the more aristocratic and conservative sects adopt the same principle, and follow, though more slowly and timidly, the same tendency that we mark in these plebeian and radical sects, condemned for their wildness, extravagance, follies, and absurdities, not to say blasphemies, by their own brethren. All are moving in the same direction, and animated by the same spirit, and are sure in time, if not arrested in their course, to reach the same result. The reformer who asserted the dissolubility of marriage, and made sentimental love its basis, asserted the seminal principle of free-love. He who contends for political equality, asserts in principle social equality, and has no logical stopping-place this side of communism : a community of goods and a community of wives. This is seen here better than elsewhere.

The fact is that in non-Catholic communities we find a reproduction, more or less complete, of ancient Greek and Roman paganism. Perhaps the corruption and degradation of the family is not yet as universal as under ancient civilized paganism, and may even differ somewhat in form ; but we have found no abomination in heathenism that we cannot match in non-Catholic societies, and even in our own free and enlightened country, down to open and undeniable demon or devil-worship. Satan reigns in all apostate societies, and only varies his practices according to the temper of individuals and the times. In rejecting the patriarchal religion, the gentiles fell back on nature ; in rejecting the

Catholic Church, and treating the pope as an usurper, as Antichrist, and making war against him and whatever is catholic, universal, and immutable, modern societies have done the same; but, as we have already said, neither individuals nor society can stand on nature alone, for nature has not its reason in itself, and does not and cannot, without the supernatural, suffice for nature. If men and nations do not rise above the natural virtues, they are sure to fall below them. He who casts off the authority of God inevitably becomes captive to Satan. The classics say many beautiful things of nature, but paganism is the practical commentary on their fine sayings; and its vices, its immoralities, its dissoluteness, superstitions, crimes, impurities, cruelties, and abominations are the practical and unanswerable refutation of the theory of the sufficiency of nature. It is the practical result in all ages and nations of the folly or madness of what is called *rationalism*, or of the effort to base religion and morality on nature alone.

The only possible way to restore and preserve the family in its purity and integrity, is to return to the Catholic idea of marriage, without which there is no family. In this most Protestant nation, which has departed further from the Catholic ideal than any other modern nation, the family has disappeared, or is rapidly disappearing, and American society is rapidly becoming, has wellnigh become, an aggregation, not of families, but of individuals. Marriage of a sort may be retained in name, but, save with our Catholic population, it is deprived of sanctity, unity, and indissolubility; and even our Catholic population find by experience that "evil communications corrupt good morals." But let us not deceive ourselves: Catholic marriage is impracticable, impossible even, in a non-Catholic society, as is evident from the fact that no non-Catholic community retains it. A return to it as an isolated reform would not rehabilitate the family; it would be like sewing a piece of new cloth on an old garment. Catholic marriage is interwoven with the whole Catholic system, and cannot be isolated from it, or observed in its purity and integrity without the Catholic faith, Catholic training and discipline, or without the gracious aids the Catholic Church supplies to her faithful children, and to none others.

To restore the Catholic family based on Catholic marriage, it is necessary for our non-Catholic societies to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church; in plain words, to be recon-

verted to Christianity, from which they have virtually, if not formally apostatized. Catholic marriage cannot be reëstablished by secular legislation, nor grafted on Protestantism or infidelity. It can be restored only by a sincere and hearty return to the church, to the whole Catholic system, from the pope down to the holy-water pot; for Catholicity is a whole and all its parts hang together and depend on one another. Break it into fragments, as does paganism, as does Protestantism, and you lose its life which is in its unity and integrity, and not one of its fragments has any life or life-giving power. Hence the condemnation of all heresy and schism.

Society depends on the family, the family on Christian, that is to say, Catholic marriage, as the excellent Abbé Riche amply proves; and Catholic marriage depends on Catholic faith and discipline, together with the grace of the sacraments. This brings us back to what the *Review* has always insisted on: that it is only by a return and filial submission to the church that the wounds of modern society can be healed. The modern world has deserted the Rock of salvation, abandoned the Fountain of living and life-giving waters, and the darkness and abominations of paganism resume their ancient sway. It is paganism that spreads over the land,—the paganism, polished and refined, of the classics, it may be, but none the less paganism for that. It is paganism even in nominally Christian lands, that the Christian missionary encounters and must once more vanquish. There are, doubtless, millions of good Catholics yet in the world, but the ruling classes of the several nations are as pagan as they were in the time of the apostles, and more difficult to convert. Not heresy alone, but paganism, the Christian must now war against.

FATHER THÉBAUD'S IRISH RACE.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for October, 1873.]

It is refreshing to meet, in these days of superficiality and flippancy, with a book from an author who thinks, and has mastered his subject. Father Thébaud has here given us a genuine book, solid and erudite, really profound and instructive, full of intense interest to many millions of American citizens, and of the greatest value to the philosophy of history. At last something like justice has been done to the Irish character by a writer not of Irish birth or descent. The author has not indeed given us a full history of the race or of Ireland, but he has given us the key to Irish history, and introduced order into what has seemed to us hitherto a chaotic mass of dry details, by setting forth clearly and distinctly the principles and causes in which they originate, and which explain them.

The author has evidently made a profound study of the Irish character, and his judgment of the genius and mission of the Irish race strikes us as just, and, as far as it goes, final. He regards, we think justly, the Irish as a providential people called, trained, and fitted by Providence to a special work in maintaining and diffusing the true faith, hardly less so than the children of Israel, who were called to be the conservators of the primitive traditions and to prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah, who was to be born of their race. We agree fully with the author that every nation has a distinct character of its own, which cannot be destroyed without the destruction of the greater part of the nation itself. We agree also with him that this character is not only persistent, but providential; yet, we have been in the habit of considering that, except in the case of the Hebrew people, each nation derives its distinctive character not directly from its progenitors, since all nations have had the same progenitor, nor from the direct act of Providence, but indirectly through second or natural causes. I doubt if all the diverse tribes and nations— the Keltæ, the Teutons, and Slaves—of

**The Irish Race in the Past and the Present.* By the Rev. Aug. G. Thébaud, S. J. New York : 1873.

the Japhetic race have derived their distinctive national traits from Japhet, the younger son of Noah, who is their common progenitor, or that these have been created by God, otherwise than through the action of created agencies. If the author is right in his ethnology, the Irish, and the English who, he tells us, are of Scandinavian origin, do not owe their respective characteristics to the direct action of God. But this is a matter of no great bearing on the characteristics and mission of the Irish race.

Father Thébaud regards the Irish as a branch of the Keltic family, and illustrates Irish characteristics by the continental Keltæ or Gauls, as the Romans called them, and those of the Gauls by those of the Irish. This is the generally received view; but in a pretty thorough investigation we made some years since, in answer to the question who were the Celts or Keltæ, we were led to doubt if the Irish are of the same race as the inhabitants of ancient Keltica, now France, and the Armoricans and Britons. That the Irish and the Gael of Scotland, or the Scoti, who gained the supremacy over the Picts, and gave their name to North Britain, were of the same race, there can be no doubt; but that the Irish and the Welsh, or ancient Britons, are of the same race is not fully proved to our satisfaction. The earliest settlers of Ireland, we should maintain, were, probably, Iberians from Spain, but who were the Scoti or Milesians who invaded the island and subdued its original inhabitants, remains to us an unanswered and unanswerable question.

Father Thébaud may be right; we certainly cannot prove that he is wrong, but we do not feel certain that he is right. For ourselves we prefer to consider the Irish, or the Scots as they were formerly called, as the most ancient civilized people of Europe, or now existing on the globe, but without attempting to determine their race affiliations. Their language is said to belong to the Japhetic group of languages, but some Irish scholars tell us that it bears, perhaps, a still stronger resemblance to the Semitic group. Has it not been classed with the Aryan or Indo-Germanic family, mainly because it has been assumed to be identical with the Welsh and Armorican dialect? Are the Erse and Welsh dialects really identical? We are incompetent to decide. But the dispute among philologists as to which group of languages the Irish belongs to, is at any rate a proof of its extreme antiquity, and that it originated at the point where

the divergence of the Semitic and Japhetic groups was in its beginning, and had not as yet extended far enough to be unmistakable.

There are undoubtedly many things in common between the Irish and the continental Kelts before the Roman conquest of the Gauls, but perhaps not more than there were at the same epoch between the Gallic and the Germanic tribes. Pelloutier, in his "Histoire des Celtes," maintains that the Celts—or, as the word should be written and pronounced, *Kelts*, with the C like *K*, as formerly in Latin, corresponding to the Greek Kappa, as it did in Anglo-Saxon and does in the Irish of to-day—were of the same race with the Germans, and applies to them the account given us of the Germans by Tacitus, which is to be also applied by Beaufort, in his "République Romaine," to the Romans, held by him to be of Keltic origin. It is still disputed by ethnologists whether the Belgæ of Cæsar, the Fir-Bolgs of the Irish annals, were of Keltic or Teutonic origin, though Merivale gives very strong reasons for holding them to be a branch of the Keltic family. In our judgment, which is worth very little, the Irish belonged to an earlier emigration from Upper or Central Asia than either the Keltic or the Teutonic, and we base our judgment on the fact that their language is older. Their patriarchal or clan system, which prevailed universally prior to Nimrod, the stout hunter before the Lord, who was a builder of cities, is more perfect than with any other known people, and their religion, as Father Thébaud himself proves, was less corrupt, which is evidence that they emigrated at a very early stage of the grand gentile apostasy, if not before it, perhaps in the very days of Phaleg, when the dispersion of mankind, according to their several nations, began. The traces discovered here and there of Phœnician mythology and idolatry, are probably due to the Phœnicians and Carthaginians who, long subsequently, traded in their ports, and had factories on their coasts.

If we give any credit to the Irish annals, and the tendency of recent investigation is to confirm them, the Irish, at the epoch of the Roman conquest of Gaul, were a more polished people and had a higher civilization than the Gallic tribes who were subdued by Cæsar and his legions. The Irish had at that time, as Father Thébaud proves, and had had long before, a rich and peculiar literature, of which numerous fragments still remain; but, if Julius Cæsar is to

be believed, the Britons and the continental Kelts had none, and certainly no trace of a literature of any sort have they left behind them. Father Thébaud argues that they must have had a literature, and that Cæsar was not well informed, because the Irish certainly had. But this sort of reasoning does not strike us as conclusive. We do not deny the alleged Keltic filiation of the Irish, but we do not feel certain of it; and for ourselves we believe the Irish were in possession of their beautiful island, and were a civilized people, long before the continental or British Kelts set out on their migration from Asia westward. We believe they were directed by Providence from the eastward to the western isle, before they had fallen into the corruption originating with the Hamitic family, and were preserved comparatively pure from idolatry and immorality, ready to receive with their whole heart the Gospel when presented to them, and to become in due time, through ages of suffering and martyrdom, the missionary people of the great Japhetic race.

This last, after all, is what, and precisely what Father Thébaud has written his book to prove, and prove it he does, of the Irish race; and we differ from him, if at all, only on some incidental points, not essential to his main argument or purpose. We do not seek to settle the affiliations of the Irish people. They are peculiar, with distinctive features of their own. We do not find their chief characteristics in any other people. They have more resemblance to the ancient Spanish or Iberian race, than to the Gallic tribes conquered by Cæsar, and even to the modern Spaniards than to the modern French, which we regard as in their favor, for after the Irish, we count the Spanish race the finest and noblest in the world, though greatly deteriorated since the accession to the throne of Spain of the great grandson of the Bourbon, Louis XIV., and the deleterious influences of France.

The author gives as a characteristic of the Keltæ, and therefore of the Irish, their wonderful force of expansion; but, if this means expansion by force of arms, as it would seem it does, it is hardly true of the Irish, however true it may be of the people of the country the Greeks called Keltica, and the Romans Gallia, which was somewhat more extensive than the present France, or France even before her recent dismemberment. The Irish colonized the Scottish Isles, and the Scottish Highlands, and their race

gradually absorbed or drove out the Picts and obtained the sovereignty; but they were never an aggressive or robber people, and their wars, except of clan with clan and between their chiefs or chieftains, were wars in defence of their country against foreign invaders, as the author amply proves. They were an agricultural and pastoral people, cultivating the arts of peace. Inhabiting an island in the ocean, with no fleet, commercial or military, except their light curraghs, and their trade in the hands of foreigners and carried on in foreign bottoms, it is not easy to see how they could, whatever their disposition, have engaged in a career of expansion by force of arms. The point on which we are disposed to differ from Father Thébaud is as to the affiliations of the Irish race, not as to the characteristics of the Irish race itself. We do not believe that the Irish can be shown to have been a branch of any great conquering or robber race, and they never were and never have been a predatory people. Their foreign expeditions prior to their conversion appear to have been limited to sudden raids on the neighboring coasts of England, and perhaps of the continent, such as were possible to be undertaken in their curraghs. As a rule Ireland sufficed for the Irish, and they lived at home, self-sustained and self-sufficing. It would be contrary to the providential mission of the Irish people to suppose it otherwise. After their conversion, the Irish became, in some measure, an expansive and a conquering people. But her armies were composed of peaceful monks, and her conquests were peaceful conquests to the Gospel, in making which her soldiers of the cross were sometimes slain but never slew.

Our view of the Irish race is that they were detached from the parent stock before the patriarchal religion had become to any great extent corrupt, or while they still retained the religion and traditions of Noah in great force and comparative purity, and, directed by Providence to the western isle they still inhabit, where, separated in some sort from the rest of the world, they preserved in comparative purity and vigor the primitive religion, the primitive civilization, institutions, manners, and customs, as transmitted from antediluvian times through Noah and his sons; and where they were held by Providence, so to speak, in reserve till the coming of St. Patrick to bring them into the Christian church, and enable them to enter on their missionary work. They were never an uncivilized, a barbarous, or an idolatrous people; only they were civilized after the Noachic

pattern, not after that of Nimrod, and perhaps that of Cain, which alone, in the estimation of the modern world, is civilization. This easily explains the facility and thoroughness with which the Irish people received the faith, when preached to them by their great apostle, unexampled elsewhere; and it also explains the antagonism of the Irish and Anglo-Normans, which was as great when both professed the same religion as it has been since the English nation apostatized, as well as why no modern nation has ever extended a helping hand to the Irish in their fearful struggle for existence, except moved by motives of self-interest or of hostility to England.

The antagonism is not due precisely to difference of race, but to the difference of civilization. To the Anglo-Norman, the Irish, representing the oldest civilization in the world, which they had, as we have said, preserved in comparative purity from Noah down to the traitor king of Leinster, were not civilized at all, but barbarians, savages of little more account than wild beasts, whom, as it is said to-day of our Indian tribes, the interests of civilization required to be exterminated; while to the Irish mind, the Anglo-Normans were robbers, ruffians, unmitigated savages, cruel, heartless, without any sense of justice or humanity, worthy descendants of the pirates of the North, veneered by a thin covering—derived through France—of the Græco-Roman or Italo-Greek civilization, itself of barbaric origin. The two civilizations were essentially antagonistic, and by no possibility could coexist on the same territory in harmony. The Normans at first tried to bring the Irish under their order of civilization; but failing in that they directed their efforts for four hundred years to the degradation and extinction of the Irish race, with what success history tells us when it states that the great Anglo-Norman lords settled in Ireland, adopted the manners and customs of the Irish, intermarried with them, and became more Irish than the Irish themselves.

Perhaps one of the most striking chapters of Father Thébaud's book is that in which he presents the Irish clan system in conflict with Norman feudalism. He is disposed to ascribe the origin of feudalism to the Scandinavians, though others suppose it to be of Germanic origin; we see no reason for denying it a Romanic origin. Under the Roman system political power and civil rights were attached to the land, not to the person or proprietor, nor to the *gens*.

The land was held to own the man, not the man the land. Under the Roman empire, the emperor, who succeeded to all the rights of the republic, political, civil, military, and religious, was held to be the sole proprietor accepted by the land, and hence, as we say now, the sole landholder. All others held land only by lease or by benefice from the emperor. Here, if we mistake not, are all the bases of feudalism. Under feudalism political power and civil rights went with the land, and were the same, let who would be the landholder. They attached to the fief, not to the person of the feudatory. In the Irish order of civilization, the land after a certain reserve for the chiefs, belonged to the clansmen in common, while the power, regulated by law and custom, was vested in the chief, whose kindred all the clan were or were held to be. The chief's power did not rest on his being the supreme landlord, but on his relationship to the clan; and its exercise was tempered by affection, as is that of the father of the family. All the clansmen were of the family of the chief or chieftain, either by blood or adoption. Hence the Irish system tended to preserve the family, and to develop and strengthen that wonderful family affection—love for husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, and relatives to the remotest degree—so characteristic, in our own day even, of the Irish, and which contrasts so strikingly with the indifference of the Anglo-Saxons, who sold their own offspring into slavery, and the feeble influence of family and domestic affections among us Anglo-Americans. They are not Irish mothers, unless completely americanized, among whom prevails the horrid and shameful practice of fœticide, which, but for the migration of foreigners hither, would, if continued, before many years depopulate the country, especially in the older settled states.

The author has spoken of the marvellous force of expansion of the Keltic race, but there is one characteristic of the Irish, which, though his whole book tends to prove it, we do not find that he anywhere distinctly notes: that is, their marvellous power of absorption or of assimilation of foreign elements. The French have it in a certain degree, the Teutonic races not at all. The German never assimilates a foreign tribe, and makes it German. He can be assimilated, but cannot assimilate. Ireland has been invaded and overrun, in one sense conquered, many times; but in all cases the Irish have succeeded in absorbing and assimilating their

conquerors. The Danes that invaded the island, reënforced for the space of two hundred years with new expeditions from Scandinavia, were either expelled or absorbed into the population of the country as good Irishmen, without impairing in any perceptible degree the force of the Irish civilization. The Anglo-Normans, backed by the whole force of England, made relentless war on the Irish civilization for four hundred years without success, and found themselves at the end transformed into Irishmen, with Irish tastes, Irish manners and customs, fighting in defence of Irish laws and institutions. The English apostatized from the church, and tried to overcome the Irish persistence in their faith and traditional civilization, by sustaining with its armies Protestant ascendency, and a penal legislation that pagan Rome might have envied. Yet it did not succeed. By bribes—the Protestant method of conversion, where physical force fails it; by establishing and sustaining Protestant colonies in the island; by robbing the chief and his clansmen of their land, and reducing the mass of the people to the most abject poverty, they so far gained ground, that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the population was not far from three millions, the Protestants, of all classes and nationalities, were about equal in numbers to the Irish who adhered to their traditional faith and usages. The clans were broken up; the chiefs exterminated, living in exile, or reduced to the ranks of the peasantry; a new nobility, aliens in blood and religion, substituted for them and endowed with the lands of the clan or sept; and yet at the end of that century, the most gloomy century perhaps in Irish history, the Irish had become nearly four to one of the resident Protestant population of the island, and now, with a population in round numbers of five and a half millions, four millions and a half are Catholics, without counting the millions of Catholics that have been swept away by famine and pestilence or that have emigrated to the United States and to every part of the British empire.

This proves that the Irish civilization, placed side by side with any other, is the stronger, more persistent, more normal, and, with every earthly advantage against it, is sure to gain the victory. This we attribute to the fact that it preserves the primitive traditions of mankind, reënforced by the Catholic faith, while all other civilizations have originated since the lapse of the nations into barbarism and idolatry, and are repugnant to, or at best a departure from, the

normal order of society, or to the Christian order of civilization. The Irish order is based on truer, deeper, and more universal principles than the Anglo-Norman, the modern English, or the ancient Romanic order. The Irish offered little or no opposition to the reception of Christianity, and St. Patrick left Ireland more thoroughly Christian at his death, after thirty-two years of apostolic labors, than the Roman empire was more than six hundred years after St. Peter had erected his apostolic chair in Rome, the capital and centre of the pagan world. Indeed, the Italo-Greek or Romanic civilization was inherently opposed to Christianity, and the struggle of the church with it has never ceased and is to-day, in Italy, Germany, Russia, and the East, hardly less fierce than it was in the time of Nero, Decius, or Diocletian.

The Irish civilization being traditional, and the perpetuation of that which obtained before the lapse of the gentile world into barbarism—the result of idolatry and devil-worship—and in greater purity and vigor than that of any other people, except the Hebrew people, it is necessarily stronger than any other; and as long as the Irish people are true to it, it is invincible. The only formidable enemies it has to dread are those hot-headed, enthusiastic, but ill-advised patriots who place Ireland before the Irish, and labor to unite all the inhabitants of the island, whatever their creed or sect, in defence, not of Irish civilization, but of Ireland. Their success would be the destruction of Irish civilization, which places the man before the land, and would base sovereignty in the the landholder instead of the chief whose authority derives from his personal relation to his clansmen. They are, unconsciously perhaps, laboring to plant in Ireland the system which the Irish race has ever resisted, and thus far, on its own soil, at the cost of untold sufferings, has successfully resisted. They are laboring not to restore to the Irish race the ownership of Ireland, but to make the Irish territory the owner of the people who inhabit it, as the sacred territory of ancient Rome was the owner of the Roman senate and people, and their sovereign. These patriots, whether called Young Irelanders, Fenians, or advocates of Home Rule, are seeking to substitute a territorial sovereign for a personal chief, a territorial magistracy for the patriarch, the father or head of a family: that is, the Roman or Anglo-Norman order of civilization, sprung from barbarism and idolatry, as developed or modified by modern American and

continental republicanism, for the Irish civilization which finds its type and basis in the Noachic civilization, which it has retained for over four thousand years. They are, perhaps without knowing it, traitors to Irish civilization, to all that has distinguished the Irish race, and constituted its glory. Hence the Irish prelates and clergy as a body, while deeply resenting the wrongs of their people and sympathizing with their sufferings, are strongly opposed to those so-called patriots who place the land or country above the people. The last day of the Ireland of tradition, of history, of glory, will have come, when the Catholic Irish, the only real Irish, shall listen to them so far as to be induced to assume a ground on which their bitter enemies could unite with them and both act together in harmony as one people, for an abstraction called country. The Irish need only wait patiently for a few years longer, and all the inhabitants of the island will, in spite of England, be assimilated to them, and the victory be won. It is nearly won now, and it would be bad policy, and worse strategy, to abandon the advantages already gained.

We have always heretofore regarded the Græco-Roman type of civilization, as developed in our American constitution, as the highest type of civilization the world has known since the great gentile apostasy, and supposed that it only needed the Catholic faith and worship to be perfect as any civilized order can be; but Father Thébaud, in giving us a clew to Irish history, which we before had lacked, has enabled us to perceive a higher as well as an older type, which we call the Irish type, and which is not only higher and older, but stronger and more persistent, through what we believe have been and still are the designs of Providence with regard to the Irish race. Were we writing our "American Republic" now, after having read Father Thébaud—from whom we seldom differ, except in drawing conclusions from his premises different from those he himself draws—we should so far modify it as to place the Irish type above the Roman, and to correct, in some respects, our definition of barbarism. We had not studied with proper care the patriarchal civilization, nor did we then understand that the Irish race had preserved it in greater purity and vigor than any other people, except the Hebrew people, until the coming of the Messiah.

We may be told of the internal feuds of the septs and clans; we are not ignorant of them, and have been nauseated

with them from our boyhood; but we do not pretend that the Irish have no faults; we do not look for perfection in men since the fall, and no civilization, not even the church, takes away free-will. But the faults, nay, the crimes of the Irish, result as a rule, from sudden passion and quick sense of honor, rather than from cold, deliberate malice. The feuds of which so much is made are family quarrels, and we believe their frequency and extent have been greatly exaggerated even by Irish popular writers themselves. Besides, they spring from noble qualities, and indicate a people with strong family affections, a nice sense of honor, not to say a lively sense of justice. Every clansman was a kinsman of the chief, and regarded his honor as his own. The same sentiment ran through every sept composing the clan towards its chieftain, and through every family of the sept towards its head, and towards every member. It was worth something to generate so noble a sentiment, and the evils which occasionally resulted were far overbalanced by the good. The Irishman of the humblest class was the kinsman of his chief, and maintained a manly bearing. Even to-day you will find in the humblest Irish peasant neither that servility nor the boorishness which you find in the English or German peasant, whose ancestors were slaves or villeins; compared with either, the Irish peasant has the feelings and manners of a gentleman.

The power of endurance of the Irish race is most wonderful. Naturally the race is remarkable for its rare physical development; and it furnishes specimens of both manly and female beauty and strength unmatched in any other known race. The Irish, and their congeners the Scotch, surpass in physical strength and hardiness, it has been ascertained, every other European people. This may, in part at least, be explained by their general freedom from vice and immorality, by the pure and virtuous lives of the women of the race, for which they have been distinguished in all ages, before as well as since their conversion to Christianity, which goes to prove the primitive and normal character of the Irish civilization, and that it always remained free from the gross corruptions and abominable superstitions into which all other gentile nations fell. It goes also to prove Father Thébaud's thesis, that the Irish have been all along preserved by Providence and trained to be a missionary people, especially to the English-speaking world of our times, thus blessing those that have cursed them, and doing good to

those that despitefully used them. Their endurance surpasses that of any other people, and the race has survived wrongs, privations, and sufferings, that would have extinguished any other race. Deprived of their land by their English conquerors, reduced to the most abject poverty, placed out of the protection of law, treated as wild beasts, whom it was a virtue rather than a crime to kill, denied all lucrative employments, even the ordinary means of subsistence—yet they have survived, and as the martyrs under tortures baffled the utmost rage and ingenuity of their torturers, have fairly overcome the cruelty and malice of their enemies by their virtues and supernatural power of endurance.

We say designedly their *supernatural* power of endurance, for it is not in nature to survive the ever-renewed efforts of their powerful enemies to extinguish them. Had not God sustained them by giving them a strength not their own, they must have succumbed; they could not have survived, far less have come off conquerors. We will not attempt to describe the wrongs and sufferings of the Irish people. We could not describe them if we would; they are indescribable. They cannot be told, nor even imagined; and yet they have been endured. The severest comment on the boasted Anglo-Norman civilization is simply to name the Irish people. England leads to-day what is called the civilization of the world, and she gets credit for humanity! The civilization she leads is based on trade, and has for its chief elements plunder, robbery, fraud, deception, oppression, cruelty, ferocity, and self-laudation. It is only a varnished barbarism, and hardly even that. God may overrule her evil for good, and make her wickedness turn to his glory; but at present she continues the civilization of the vikings, sea-robbers, or Scandinavian pirates, the colluvies of all the continental nations from whom she has the honor of descending, and whose virtues she inherits. If, in these later years, she has somewhat softened, and begun to think of mending her ways, it is owing chiefly to Irish influence, which for seven hundred years she has labored in vain to crush.

We, probably, attribute less to the influence of race than does Father Thébaud. We do not see in the long hostility between the English and the Irish a conflict simply of races, but of two orders of civilization or of social organization. There are no bitterer enemies of the Irish than anglicized and protestantized Irishmen; and these apostate Irishmen

have, since the so-called reformation, been the principal agents employed by the English government to oppress and brutalize the Irish people. We think a renegade Irishman will be even more bitter and cruel towards the faithful Irish than the average Englishman. We do not think, therefore, that the superior virtues and humanity of the real Irish are so much due to their race as to their religion and social organization—what we call their civilization, providentially preserved from patriarchal times. God has made of one blood all the nations of men. Destroy utterly the family system retained by the Irish, divest them of their Catholic faith, and assimilate them to the English or the Americans, who are *les Anglais renforcés*, and we think they would be no better than either, if not, indeed, worse. Hence we deprecate the mad attempts of americanized Irishmen to introduce the American system into Ireland. Hence, also, we regret our own former efforts to americanize the Irish settled in our own country. So long as they retain their Irish characteristics and their invincible attachment to their religion and their traditional civilization, they supply the very element the population of this country most needs. The Catholic Germans are doing their work and doing it well, but they do not introduce, strictly speaking, any new social element, or the influence of any higher type of civilization than our own, and are more likely to be assimilated to the general population of the country, than they are to assimilate that population to themselves.

Father Thébaud shows from the dealings of Providence with the Irish that their mission is to convert and bring back to the church of God the English-speaking world, more especially the various tribes and people over whom floats the English flag. They are to follow in the wake of the English conquests, and to turn them into conquests of mercy. The civilization, institutions, manners, and customs of the Irish opposed scarcely a single obstacle to their reception of Christianity when presented to them by St. Patrick in the fifth century. They forthwith became the principal agents in the conversion of the Scotch, only partially christianized by St. Palladius, and in the sixth and seventh centuries their missionaries planted Christianity in the northern and midland counties of England; and colonies of Irish monks, with St. Columbanus at their head, revived the half-forgotten faith of the Gauls, Keltic and Germanic, and established monasteries in Gaul, Switzerland, and even Italy, which be-

came famous seats of literature and science, and nurseries of faith and piety. They claim to have taken the lead in the missions in Germany and Scandinavia which were converted by missionaries from England of the Anglo-Saxon race, though it must be confessed that the missionary zeal of the Anglo-Saxons soon died away, and nearly all the countries christianized by England have apostatized, and she with them.

In our times the Irish have resumed their mission for which ages of untold suffering have prepared them. They are to be found wherever English authority extends, planting the cross and introducing and sustaining Christian faith and civilization. The English government does not favor them, but it needs them and could not carry on its great military expeditions and vast industrial enterprises without them. England needs them as soldiers and as laborers; and as much as it dislikes them and hates their religion or fears the pope, it is obliged to tolerate them. What is peculiar in the modern missions of the Irish in the English-speaking world is that the people precede the pastor. They go out from Ireland as soldiers or as laborers, and wherever they go they carry their faith and devotion to the church with them. The priest soon follows them, and the nucleus of a Christendom is formed. The revival of Catholicity within the present century in England herself is chiefly due to the migration of the Irish to her towns and villages. The English Catholics at the close of the last century had dwindled down, as some accounts say, to thirty thousand; there are now not less than a million and a half of Catholics in England, and two-thirds of them, it may be safely said, are Irish, or descendants of the Irish. Much the same thing may be said of the revival of Catholicity in the Lowlands of Scotland. The Irish have carried the church with them to Australia, Van Diemen's Land, and other places in the British dominions, in relation to which we must refer our readers to Father Thébaud's pages, while we return to the Irish missions in our own country. No considerable emigration of the Catholic Irish to the United States had taken place prior to 1820. There was a respectable body of Maryland Catholics, there had been a number of respectable French Catholics from Hayti or San Domingo settled in several sections of the country; there were French Catholics in Louisiana and Michigan, a few Spanish Catholics in Mobile, New Orleans, and Florida, and Catholics of various

nationalities in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston; but though the Irish element was largely represented, it was hardly anywhere predominant, and few of the most sanguine among Catholics looked forward to much more than to be permitted to reside in the country without having their churches pulled down, their goods confiscated, or their throats cut. The tone of Catholics was subdued, apologetic, and the great study seemed to be not to give umbrage to Protestants, or to irritate their prejudices. It was no doubt a necessity of the times, and the prudence of our fathers is to be commended, and their apparent timidity not censured. They were holy men, fitted to their times, and by their quiet and inoffensive lives to a great extent disarmed prejudice, and laid deep and solid the foundations of the church in this fearfully hostile country.

But in 1820 the migration of the Irish laboring class began, or received a new impetus, and a great change in the tone of Catholics began. They did not come uninvited, New York state had commenced her great public works, the Champlain and Erie canals. The contractors soon found that, though American engineers, overseers, mechanics, and teamsters could be obtained, perhaps in sufficient numbers and with passable skill, American laborers, to take the pick and spade and do the work of excavation, could not be found. An American could invent a steam excavator, but he could not or would not dig. There was no resource for the contractors but to send to Ireland, where the supply of labor was largely in excess of the demand, and import Irish laborers. The factory system going into operation about the same time absorbed the farmers' daughters, hitherto relied on for domestic help, and there sprang up a great demand for female domestics. So Bridget was also sent for and came over, and though many are the complaints we hear of her, a great blessing she has proved to the country. The only fault to be found with her, is, that she has become too americanized in her notions and lost somewhat of her genuine Irish character.

In a word, the industries and wants of the country in the non-slaveholding states, after the peace of 1815, created a demand for both male and female labor which the home market could not supply. Ireland, owing to Protestant ascendency and English misrule, could and did supply the demand. But these Irish laborers and domestics, without whom our public works, canals, and railroads could not have

been constructed, our manufacturing industries sustained, or domestics be had, were Catholics, and brought their faith with them, and must have the priest and the church; and hence the marvellous growth of Catholicity in this spiritual wilderness of ours. The old American people hated the Catholic religion as the devil does holy water; but business is business, and they were obliged to tolerate it, for the services of these Catholic Irish were indispensable to their industrial enterprises and to the comfort of their homes. If English capital and American enterprise have done much to develop the material resources of our country, the migration of Irish labor hither has done still more; for without it, the development would have been impossible.

What the Irish have done for religion in this country, Father Thébaud's book will tell better than we can; their influence on American civilization, in preparing it for the reception of the Catholic faith, and the country for a true Catholic civilization, cannot yet be told. But it has been very great, especially in the New England states, where it has already nearly abolished puritanism; and if it has not yet brought the descendants of the Puritans up to the Catholic standard, it has to a great extent brought them back to nature, the first step necessary to be taken, since puritanism is unnatural, against nature, not supernatural. The Irish, we have said, are a missionary people, and their success is not to be measured by numbers or the éclat of the conversions they effect; but by their silent influence on those without. Their priests are pastors of Catholic congregations, not missionaries to an unbelieving or heretical people, and their principal duty is to look after and take care of the faith and the virtue of their own people, not to labor directly for the conversion of non-Catholics. But each priest with his congregation becomes a centre of light and Catholic influence, which gradually and silently attracts and assimilates to the body of the faithful, no one can tell how or when, those even who were the bitter enemies of the church. Direct missions to the non-Catholic American people would accomplish little, effect few conversions; and we think Father Thébaud is right in holding that the predominance of the church here, if it is ever obtained, must be from the growth within, rather than from accessions from without, as it has been in Ireland for the last century and a half. The Protestant people will gradually be assimilated to the Catholic body, or disappear, for the Catholic Irish bring hither in

all senses a more vigorous life than non-Catholic Americans have, or can well understand.

The Irish are malleable, have great flexibility, but also great persistence of character; still the danger to their mission here is, that they will americanize too much and too rapidly, and become too prosperous in the American sense of prosperity. They have done much to catholicize, still more to hibernicize the country, but what they have now to do, is, to guard against becoming themselves americanized; whence the significance of the movement for Catholic schools. The moment they exchange their original Irish characteristics for those of the country, they lose the principal part of their power. Americanized priests are the least influential, even with Americans. Some neo-Americans complained, some years ago, that Irish Catholics conducted themselves as a foreign colony in the country; and we ourselves regarded it as a hindrance to the spread of Catholicity; but we have lived long enough to see that it is desirable that they should continue so to conduct themselves. If they were to adopt, faith excepted, American modes of thought, manners, and customs, and become absorbed in the Anglo-American community, they would lose all their influence in softening the hardness, and in relaxing the rigidity of our puritan manners, so hostile to all real virtue, and power of infusing into our national life a freer, a more hospitable, genial, and cheerful tone and spirit. It is doubtful, if completely americanized and severed from their traditional relations, they would retain even their faith beyond the second generation. Americans, even if converted, yet receiving nothing from the example of an old and persistent Catholic people, or from association with them, and retaining in all, except in matters strictly of faith, their American modes of thought, manners, and usages, would soon lose all Catholic public spirit, and pare their Catholicity down till hardly distinguishable from Protestantism. They and Protestant Americans would form one community, intermarry, and leave their children to grow up and remain Catholics or Protestants as convenience or caprice might dictate.

There is nothing in the political or civil constitution and fundamental law of the country incompatible with the most inflexible Catholicity, but in every other sense American civilization is decidedly anti-Catholic, that is, decidedly and inveterately Protestant. It is easier for the missionary to

succeed in making good Catholics of our North American Indians than of average Americans, as we now find them. The average Anglo-American has feeble family ties, growing feebler every day, little respect for authority, only a utilitarian regard for law, breaks with tradition, and cares not a straw for what his father believed or held to be sacred or obligatory. His politics are based on the principle, "I am as good as you," and his religion and morality, with his civilization, are based on the assumption that every individual is sufficient for himself, and sufficient for every thing, and has the right at all times and in all things to be his own master, and to have his own judgment and will prevail. He is gregarious rather than social, cheerless, gloomy, and opposed to all real social hilarity, mirth, or fun. He knows no cheap or light-hearted and innocent pleasures, and tolerates no enjoyment in common with the poor, or that is not costly and corrupting. In a word, he is a Protestant, abhors poverty, hates Catholicity which has the same divine service for rich and poor, the prince and the beggar.

Now it is certain that, while Catholics may even surpass Protestants in love and devotion to the independence, autonomy, and real interests of the country, they cannot adopt their manners, customs, and form one community or one homogeneous people with them. This is wherefore it is desirable that the Irish, domiciled or naturalized as citizens, with all the rights of any other class of citizens, should retain their distinctive character as Irishmen, and their attachment to their traditional Irish civilization, and therefore we rely for the conversion of the country on the internal growth, expansion, and assimilating or absorbing power of the old Catholic colonies Providence has planted in our midst, who as leaven hidden in three measures of meal, are ultimately to leaven the whole lump, than on missions directly to obtain accessions from without.

The Irish are not the only Catholic colony in the United States, far from it. Nearly all the nationalities of Europe are represented here in both the clergy and the laity, especially the Germans, who have given us a large number of our priests, secular and regular, several of our venerable prelates, and constitute about one million of our Catholic laity. We owe much to them all, especially to the French and Germans; but without making any invidious national distinctions, where all are one in faith and charity, we may say the

Irish colony are by far the most numerous, and exert greater influence on the old American people. They, too, bring with them the reminiscences of their primitive civilization, and better than any others supply what is wanting in our own.

We are far from pretending that the Irish in our country are faultless; indeed, they have many faults very shocking to American respectability, and to our puritan scribes and pharisees; but their chief real faults are of American origin, caused by American influences and American associations, and do not belong to the race, as we find it in Ireland or in any other country. They come from their attempt to imitate Americans, whose civilization is really antagonistic to their own, and from their natural gayety, full flow of animal spirits, and great physical vigor which our puritan civilization seeks to repress, but only forces to break out in the shape of vice or crime. There are no people so free from crime against person and property and from vice and immorality as the Irish in Ireland and anywhere under the British flag, excepting always offences of a political nature, almost the only offences one hears of in Ireland. Even here, the Irish and their descendants are by all odds and under every point of view, the purest, the best, and most trustworthy portion of the American people. The great body of them are chaste, industrious, ardently attached to their religion, and liberal in their contributions, often out of their very necessities, for its support. Drunkenness, do you say? Drunkenness there certainly is among them, but less than there was, perhaps than there is, among the pharisaic yet *respectable* Americans. I have never yet seen an Irish sot, such as I was in the habit of seeing in my boyhood in New England villages, hanging round the tavern or store where liquor was sold, or to be had. Much has been lost by the Maine liquor laws, which have compelled more to drink on the sly, or to substitute opium for rum. Intemperance is a terrible evil, but not so destructive to the soul, or to society even, as pride and covetousness.

There are what are called low Irish, but the low Irish never fall so low as the lower class of any other nation. Go where they are huddled together in wretched tenement houses, damp cellars, and unventilated garrets; in narrow alleys and blind courts, in the pestilence-breeding parts of our cities. You will find there poverty and dirt enough to frighten a Yankee half to death, but you will also find

there a patience and resignation, a loving trust in God, a cleanliness of heart, a purity of life and conversation, that give the lie to that puritan notion, that vice or crime and poverty go together. It was there we first learned that divine lesson to respect poverty and to honor the poor, or the meaning of our Lord when he said, "Blessed are the poor." Such heroic virtue daily and hourly practised there I have not found elsewhere. Even the most depraved Irishman is capable of sincere penitence, of grand expiation; seldom does an Irish criminal await the last penalty of the law without opening his heart to the inflowing grace of our Lord, and consoling us with his really edifying death. It may also be added that the law, in its administration, punishes as criminals among the Irish many more innocent than guilty persons. Your greatest criminals are not Irish, but Americans, Englishmen, or Germans, though sometimes assuming Irish names.

But it is time to draw our remarks on the subject of Father Thébaud's book to a close. In a few questions, mostly ethnological, we are not certain that he is right; we are disposed to hold, with Ozanam and others, that the Scandinavians, though in their piratical days somewhat a mixed race, belong in the main to the Teutonic family, and we find in their mythology striking resemblances with that of the Hindoos; we also rate higher the services of several branches of the Germanic family to the church, than the author appears to do. Christendom, after the downfall of the Roman empire of the West, was reconstituted by the popes aided by the Franks, who were Germans. Clovis was a German, and so were Charles Martel, Pepin le Bref, and Charlemagne. France, in the present sense of the word, did exist under the Carlovingian race of kings, and has no right to claim the merit of their services, as most of her historians do not scruple to do. But, aside from a few questions of this sort, we agree with the author. His book is a great book—a book of solid and conscientious learning, gravely and chastely written. We have been both charmed and instructed by it, and hold ourselves deeply indebted to the learned Jesuit who has in it done credit to the illustrious society of which he is a distinguished member. He has made a most valuable contribution to American literature.

PROTESTANT JOURNALISM.*

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for October, 1875.]

An English publishing house, some time since, gravely announced that "My Clerical Friends" was not written by its real author, but by his younger brother, author of "The Old Catholics at Cologne." It was a bookseller's trick. Only one man living could have written that remarkable work, whose style is unmistakable and inimitable; as only one man living could have written the wonderful series of essays that go to make up the goodly volume before us. The papers here collected were originally contributed to the *London Tablet*, decidedly the ablest and most purely Catholic journal published in our language, and, as to that matter, as far as our knowledge goes, in any language. The author of these papers, we understand, still continues his contributions to the *London Tablet*, and we hope he will long continue to do so. As a writer, he has hardly an equal among his contemporaries. He ranks, in our judgment, for high culture and varied learning, in native ability and masculine courage, with a Newman or a Manning, while the keenness and delicacy of his wit are unequalled by any writer of our acquaintance.

Never was Protestant journalism more perfectly characterized, or the unveracity, the ignorance, inconsistencies, and radical dishonesty of the Protestant press, both high church and low, more thoroughly exposed than in these papers, and that, too, without the slightest departure from perfect gentlemanly bearing, a discourteous, or even uncharitable expression. We will only add, that the accomplished author need not have confined his remarks exclusively to Protestant journals, even including under that term secular journalism, but might have extended them to certain so-called Catholic journals of this country, which, as far as we can judge, are as uncandid, as unfair, as untruthful, in regard to those who differ from them in opinion, especially on national or political questions, as any Protestant journals we know of, and far less courteous and gentlemanly, as well

---

**Protestant Journalism.* By the Author of "My Clerical Friends." London: 1874.

as more violent and abusive. They can fawn around and toady rich or influential Protestants; but when it concerns a Catholic who refuses to ride their hobbies, they can only vituperate and blackguard him. When his hand was in, the author might have given these intensely patriotic journals a tap of the shillelah, for, if not professedly Protestant, they are decidedly anti-Catholic in their spirit and influence, and do more than the most decided Protestant journals to lessen the respectability of the Catholic population of the country.

We distinguish between the journal and the newspaper. The newspaper originated some three hundred years ago, if we are not mistaken, in the commercial city of Venice, and was designed chiefly to communicate such intelligence as was of special interest to merchants and bankers, or, as we say now, to the business classes. Gradually it enlarged its scope, especially when transferred to England, and gave political intelligence, as well as banking and mercantile information; but it confined itself to giving current news, and avoided all political or other discussions. It grew naturally out of the invention and general adoption of the art of printing, and simply superseded the intelligence which had been, from time immemorial, communicated by written instead of printed letters. The newspaper was not only a harmless, but a useful institution.

The journal may indeed publish news, but it is not by any means a newspaper. It is of recent origin, and owes its birth to the French revolution of 1789, that fountain of so many evils, and, to human eyes, of no good. The design of the journal is to influence and control public opinion, and, through public opinion, to influence and control public action. The public to which it is addressed may be the general public, or it may be a party, a faction, a coterie, or a sect, but its design is always to influence and control the thought and action of its public, whether its public be larger or smaller; and it seeks to do this by discussion, by arguments addressed to reason or prejudice, and by declamation, or inflammatory appeals to passion. The so-called independent journalism, represented by such journals as the *N. Y. Herald*, the *N. Y. Tribune*, and the *N. Y. Sun* of this city, professes to be independent of all parties, sects, and cliques, and to set forth the views and convictions of its management alone, or what its management believes, or pretends to believe, is for the public interest. But it must

have popular support, a wide popular circulation, and, to gain this, it must court popular opinion, and study not to outrage popular prejudice. It can afford to have no unpopular principles, nor to support an unpopular cause. Indeed it cannot afford to have any principles, especially any religious principles, for any decided principles are sure to be unpopular with one or another section of the public. It, in fact, has no positive religion of any sort; and whatever religion it favors, is so vague and indeterminate that it is as good as none at all. Its influence in regard to religion is either to encourage infidelity pure and simple, or perfect indifferentism. Its religion is secularism, and it is less really independent and more fatal to all the great interests of society than even the partisan or sectarian press.

Satan never made a better hit than when he invented independent journalism; and the *New York Herald*, which so admirably represents the spirit of the age, should be, as we have no doubt it is, a great favorite with him. None but a renegade or bad Catholic could ever have founded and sustained such a marvellous journal; nor could even a bad Catholic have done it without extraordinary satanic assistance. The very design of the journal is satanic. It throws the forming and directing of public opinion and action into the hands of men who are responsible only to the laws, and hardly to them; who have and can give no guaranty of their wisdom, who scout all authority but their own, and proceed always on the assumption of their own infallibility, and that of the public to which they appeal. Independent journalism is Protestantism raised to its highest power, the deification of private judgment, and a fitting forerunner of Antichrist. Its power is immense, and its despotism is in proportion to its power. In France, in 1830, it overthrew the government and extemporized the monarchy of July; in 1848, it expelled the citizen-king, and proclaimed the democratic republic; in 1851, it overturned the democratic republic, and reëstablished the Napoleonic empire. Making itself the organ of the secret societies, it has, for the last hundred years, kept all Europe in a chronic state of insurrection, and rendered all government, but that of sheer force, impossible. It is everywhere a disturbing element, and five millions of armed men in Europe are found necessary to maintain some semblance of order against the passions it stirs up and inflames. And yet is it vociferated in our ears, "A free press is the palladium of our liberties"!

The governments for a time established and maintained a rigid censorship of the press, but without much salutary effect. Secular governments are no safer directors of thought and opinion than the journals themselves. The government censors, for the most part, sought only to protect the secular authority, and left religion and morality, the spiritual authority of the church, and all the higher and more important interests of society, to protect themselves. This was especially the case in Austria, Prussia, and the smaller German states. If they looked after the interests of religion at all, it was as the national religion, as a function of the civil government, as it is in England, and in France, where the parliaments, judicial not legislative bodies, were for centuries almost uniformly anti-Catholic, and not seldom anti-monarchical. They in general treated the church in France as a national, rarely as the catholic, church. In such cases the censorship of the press could be little else than an impertinence or an unmixed evil. We doubt if what is called preventive censorship has ever been efficient for good. The church divinely commissioned and protected is the only authority competent to exercise the censorship of the press, or the supervision of thought and opinion; and she can do it only through her own pastors, who, in our times, since secular governments no longer hold themselves amenable to the law of God, can exercise it only as directors of the consciences of the faithful.

Our Holy Father Pius IX., gloriously reigning, though a prisoner in the Vatican, is said to have recommended the bishops to encourage laymen of piety, learning, and ability to labor to counteract the evil tendency of Protestant and infidel journalism, by establishing and conducting Catholic journals. We have seen no specific recommendation of the sort from the Holy See, though the pope has undoubtedly urged the bishops to encourage Catholic laymen, eminent for their faith and piety, learning and ability, to devote themselves, by writing or through the press, to the defence and advancement of Catholic interests. The natural remedy would seem to be to meet the evil by Catholic journalism, and thus oppose the truth to the error; and something of this sort is no doubt effected by such journals as the *London Tablet*, the *Weekly Register*, the Paris *Univers* and *Le Monde*, and such periodicals as *La Civiltà Cattolica* and the *Catholic World*, but, after all, very little. Journalism being of revolutionary, that is, of Protestant and infidel

origin, does not readily lose all trace of its original nature, even in the hands of Catholics; and we see very few so-called Catholic journals that are conducted in a truly Catholic spirit. We can name not more than two or three in our own country, and they of very limited circulation. Those that have a large circulation, like the *Irish World* and the *Boston Pilot*, are national rather than Catholic journals, and in tone and temper are more Protestant or secular than Catholic. It is yet to be proved that the English-speaking Catholic population of this country, though liberal to the church, will support a purely Catholic journal. Thus far it has never done so, and the only successful papers among us have had to appeal to other than Catholic interests and affections.

Then, again, the "eminent laymen" do not seem to be very abundant with us; and such as we have, if known to be approved by the bishops and clergy, are pretty sure not to be acceptable to the people, who have a strong inclination to assert their independence of the church in all cases where they think it is at all permissible. There has been with us, thus far, little or no encouragement to eminent laymen to devote themselves to the promotion, through the press, of Catholic interests. We ourselves stand almost alone in the country, and we have been only moderately successful, but we are not a layman eminent for learning and ability, for we have very little of either. The fact is, our Catholic population are not a reading nor a thinking people, and have a horror of such reading as requires a mental effort. They hold that it is for the clergy to take care of the interests of religion, and that it is not for the laity to trouble their heads about them. It is little that your eminent laymen can do to neutralize Protestant journalism, unless backed up by the support and generous sympathy of their Catholic brethren: and, to gain that, it is not enough to be a sound and zealous Catholic, even of learning and ability.

We doubt if matters go much better in the Old World. Catholics, for a long time, have been disposed, perhaps from a mistaken or exaggerated asceticism, to give up the government of this world and the management of public affairs to Satan and his representative, Cæsar. A mere handful of Protestants, Jews, and infidels, have more than once proved themselves able to govern and tyrannize over a whole nation of Catholics. Of the twenty-five millions of souls who constituted the population of France at the outbreak of the

revolution of 1789, it is said less than one million were active revolutionists, and the terrorists were even a less proportion. The great body of the English nation were Catholic even at the accession of Elizabeth, the termagant daughter of Anne Boleyn. Italy is still, as to the immense majority of her population, Catholic; and yet a pitiable minority is suffered to oppress the nation, to tyrannize over church and state, to confiscate the goods consecrated to religion, to exile bishops and priests, expel religious from their houses, to despoil and imprison the vicar of Christ, the recognized chief of their religion, and to revel in robbery and sacrilege. What in the meantime are the Catholics doing, numerous enough to eat up the governing minority at a single meal? They are consoling themselves with the promise that the church cannot fail, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Certainly, the church cannot fail, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; but you, miserable imbeciles, may fail, and the gates of hell prevail against you.

Whenever, in any Catholic country, heretics, Jews, infidels, or mere seculars get the upperhand, oppress Catholics, and despoil and enslave the church, it is always due to the fault of Catholics; not because they refuse to use the sword against their enemies, or to fight for their liberty and the rights of God, the basis of all true liberty, but because they have lacked due vigilance and strict fidelity to the Catholic cause. Had the Italian Catholics placed their religion before all other considerations, as was their duty, refused to listen to the siren song of Italian unity sung by the enemies of their faith, and set their faces resolutely against any and every measure hostile to the rights of the papacy, they could without any fighting have prevented the infidel minority now oppressing them from ever acceding to power. The minority won their victory while the Catholic majority went to sleep. Luther would have made no head-way if the Catholics of Germany in his time had better understood their religion, been more devoted to it, and more vigilant and earnest in guarding against innovations. It was because Catholics were careless and failed to watch and pray, and were not thoroughly attached to the head of the church, that they fell a prey to the so-called reformers. The same, or nearly the same, may be said of England, which was never, from the Norman conquest, whatever it had been previously, thoroughly papal. The main cause of the apostasy of Eng-

land was, however, its intense nationalism and dread of foreign influence. In France, it was Gallicanism that caused the disasters to the church in that Catholic kingdom. We are far from pretending that, in either France or Germany, especially in Germany, the bishops and clergy, who wielded immense civil power, never forgot the meekness of the Gospel and the fraternity of all Christians, and governed as lords, not as pastors. We are by no means disposed to defend the proud and arrogant prince-bishops of the empire, who were at once pastors of the church and feudal lords. It must be admitted, we think, that, with the majority, the baron or the prince got the better of the pastor, and was no less oppressive to his subjects than a simple temporal lord, and sometimes even more so. We find also, that, holding their temporality from the secular prince, the prince-bishops, so long as he respected their temporality, were usually disposed to side with him against the pope. We are far from regretting the disappearance of that mixture of civil and ecclesiastical power which obtained in the middle ages under the feudal *régime*, and that spiritual benefices no longer carry with them civil functions. In this sense we are strenuous advocates of the separation of church and state. Yet, had Catholics understood themselves, been faithful to the spiritual power, or the papacy, and been vigilant, the evil could have been redressed without any convulsion or social outbreak; and we lay it down as a rule that when, in any Catholic country, the enemies of the church get the upper hand, Catholics are in fault.

The Catholic laity, until recently, have not been accustomed to take an active part in the defence or advancement of the public interests of religion, especially through the press, and are little fitted to do it with effect. They lack the training, the profound and accurate theological knowledge, and, where the public interests of religion are concerned, the necessary enterprise. In old Catholic countries the laity have in general been taught very little of their religion; their instruction seldom going beyond a few prayers, a brief catechism, and the practices observed in the church. Of the principles of religion, of the relation of the natural and the supernatural and of the several doctrines and dogmas of the church to one another, they have in general been taught nothing. Nothing is more common than to find highly educated Catholic gentlemen, well versed in the classics and the sciences, men of real scientific and liter-

ary distinction, utterly ignorant of the principles of their religion, and incapable of defending it against any class of its enemies. Indeed, there is an old law of the church that forbids laymen from writing and publishing any thing on religion without the permission of the ordinary. Among even educated laymen brought up Catholics from their childhood, it is difficult to find a man with the qualifications necessary to a successful Catholic author or journalist. The elder Lenormant, founder of *Le Correspondant*, was a man of rare culture, profound learning, and respectable at least for his scientific attainments, yet his writings proved that he knew very little of theology. Châteaubriand never learned his catechism. Even the learned, illustrious, and chivalric Montalembert, a most devoted Catholic, and one of the most distinguished men of his time, was far from being a profound or an accurate theologian. Louis Veuillot was not brought up a Catholic, but is, if we have not been misinformed, a converted Voltairian, who defends Catholic interests, as the Abbé Gaduel, we think it was, said, in the tone and spirit of Voltaire. He is able, zealous, for the most part orthodox, but narrow-minded, and ignorant of what is most needed in these times,—what we trust we may be permitted to call the philosophy of religion, or supernatural philosophy.

Ireland has no lack of eminent laymen, but they are mostly engrossed with political and national questions, and seem to regard it as impossible, or at least undesirable, to separate the Catholic question from them. We doubt if purely Catholic journalism could subsist in Ireland any more than in this country. It is not necessary to speak of Germany, for there the government allows Catholic journalism no freedom. England, owing to conversions from Anglicanism of large numbers of Anglican ministers, many of whom, in consequence of having wives living, remain in the ranks of the laity, has a large body of eminent laymen, highly educated, and of competent theological knowledge, who are able to serve the Catholic cause through the press, whether as journalists or authors, in that country; and first among them stands the truly Catholic author of the work before us. Catholic journalism meets at present a fuller development in England than elsewhere; and the English Catholics are making daily rich contributions to our Catholic literature, while the *Dublin Review* and the *Month* rank high among our very best contemporary Catholic periodicals.

The difficulties in the way of neutralizing by Catholic journalism the destructive influence of Protestant journalism, are, that we lack the Catholic public to sustain Catholic journalism and purely Catholic publications; and also, to a great extent, eminent laymen who are competent to the work that needs to be done, and are able and willing to devote themselves to the defence of purely Catholic interests through the press. But even supposing these difficulties are successfully overcome, a greater and more serious difficulty remains behind. The public, controlled by Protestant journalism, do not, and will not, as a general thing, read Catholic journals or Catholic publications. No matter how ably we write in defence of the faith, or how thoroughly and even eloquently we refute the sects and secularism, what we write will not reach those for whom it is specially designed. The Protestant and secular journals, knowing that they are in possession of the field, refuse all fair and serious argument with us, and answer us only with squibs, flings, and misstatements. The leaders of the non-Catholic community, knowing that they can only lose by fair and honorable discussion with us, study as far as possible to ignore us, to keep our publications from their people, and, if compelled to notice us at all, to prefer some false charge against us, some accusation which has no foundation, and which can only serve to keep up the prejudice against us, and render us odious to the public. We confess, therefore, that we see little that can be done through the press, to neutralize the effects of Protestant journalism, except to protect, to a certain extent, our own Catholic population against those effects. Satan has too strong a foothold for any human means to dislodge him. It is probable that the Holy Father in his recommendation only contemplated the protection of Catholics against the corrupting influence of the non-Catholic journals and publications, not the protection of the non-Catholics themselves. Even so much would be a great thing, and worthy of our most strenuous efforts. It is our firm conviction that if all who nominally belong to the church could be protected from the corrupting influences of those without, properly instructed in the principles as well as the practice of their religion, and induced to live according to the requirements of the church, heresy and all the various forms of infidelity would gradually disappear, and the entire race be gathered within the fold, and the kingdoms of this world become in very deed the kingdoms of God and his Christ.

But to return to the work before us. That Protestant journalism should be unprincipled, untruthful and unscrupulous in its treatment of Catholic questions, is nothing to surprise one, or to excite one's indignation. "Men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles." How can we expect truth and honesty, candor and fair-dealing, from a movement conceived in malice, born of falsehood and sustained only by calumny and misrepresentation? Catholic journals have no excuse when they are uncandid, unfair, and knowingly or carelessly pervert the truth. We expect, and have a right to expect, better things from them. But we have no right to expect from Protestant journalism any thing better than we get. To be honest and truthful, it must cease to be Protestant, for Protestantism in its very essence is a protest against truth and honesty. There are Protestants—we should hope not a few—who, in all except religion, are truthful and honest, kind-hearted and neighborly, generous friends, and patriotic citizens, who are rich in the natural virtues, and, in some respects, successful imitators of the Christian virtues; but Protestantism is of satanic origin, and Protestants when acting under its inspiration, that is, when acting as Protestants, are filled with satanic malice, as were those carnal Jews who rejected our Lord for a noted robber, and crucified him by the hand of Pontius Pilate between two thieves. The persecution of Catholics in England under Elizabeth more than matched, in perfidy and cruelty, the persecutions under any of the pagan Cæsars; and the Protestants of North Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, were no whit less cruel and barbarous towards all who adhered to the Catholic Church. In our days Protestants are less fanatical and cruel, because less in earnest, and because they think themselves victors, and that the church can never recover her former ascendency; but they are at bottom just as bitter towards the truth as they were in the sixteenth century.

We Catholics often complain of the falsehood and dishonesty of Protestants when treating of Catholic matters, and seem to demand of them virtues to be expected only from those who believe in the Gospel, and take Jesus Christ for their Lord and Master. We should remember, as our Lord said to the Jews, that they are of "their father the devil, and his works they will do." It is idle, when it is a question of religion, to expect from Protestants the fruits of the spirit. Satan, the better to deceive, may preach benev-

olence, turn a philanthropist, a liberalist, or a tolerationist, but he remains ever the same old serpent and arch-enemy, who is a liar from the beginning, and the father of lies. We Catholics are too reluctant to look upon Protestantism as an invention of Satan; and though recognizing it as false, heretical, we are unwilling to treat it as antichristian, and wholly opposed to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have generally regarded Protestants as members of the Christian family, though disobedient and disorderly members. This in the beginning was natural and proper enough, indeed was in some sense the fact. Through the whole of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, nearly all Protestants had been validly baptized, and it was generally supposed that Protestantism confined itself to the denial of certain specific Catholic doctrines, and was far from pretending to cast off the authority of Jesus Christ. So long as this was the case, or held to be the case, Protestants could be treated only as heretics, not as apostates: and heretics in some sense pertain to the Christian family, though, of course, they are out of the way of salvation. But now, when the presumption is that very few Protestants have been baptized, and the developments of Protestantism show that it is in its essence apostasy, not simply heresy or a congeries of heresies, we can no longer treat the great body of Protestants as belonging in any sense to the Christian family. Protestantism is not heresy, but apostasy—a real falling away from Christ the Lord.

No doubt, in the various Protestant communities or sects, there are individuals who have been validly baptized, who really believe they are, and mean to be, Christians. These are heretics indeed, certainly material, if not formal heretics, not apostates; but we apprehend that they are a small minority of the body, and are sooner or later carried away by the dominant spirit of the main body. Speaking generally, we may say the various Protestant sects have lapsed into gentilism, and are as far from the kingdom of God as were the gentiles of Greece and Rome, when the apostles went forth after the day of Pentecost to conquer the world to their divine Master. It is no evidence that Protestants are not gentiles, that they do not worship images. The ancient Persians did not worship images, and condemned image-worship as strenuously as any Protestants; and yet they were gentiles and idolaters, for they worshipped the sun, while they regarded fire as the symbol of the eternal Light. The

term *gentile* comes from *gens*, house, race, family, tribe, or nation, and is best rendered to the modern mind by the word *nation*. The essential principle of gentilism is nationalism, to which patriotism, never mentioned in the Gospel as a virtue, is very nearly related. Patriotism was the first of heathen virtues, but we do not find that Christianity recognizes it as a virtue at all. But more of this further on. The gentile nations apostatized from the patriarchal or Catholic religion, and each formed to itself a national religion, with national gods of its own, who, the Scriptures teach us, were devils:—"All the gods of the heathen are devils." The highest authority recognized by the gentiles was the national; that of the gens, tribe, or nation, what we call the civil authority, was the authority of the city or state with the republican Greeks and Romans, who regarded themselves as the only civilized people, the chief, king, or basileus, with all barbarous nations, and who, as succeeding to the patriarch, was held to be absolute lord and proprietor of the kingdom, as was the father of the family till the Christian law limited his authority, and gave the family, the wife, children, and servants, some rights which he was bound to respect.

Now we do not say that Protestants retain nothing of the provisions of the Christian law under which their ancestors were trained and christianized, any more than we say the ancient gentiles retained nothing of the patriarchal or Catholic religion. What we maintain is that they, with individual exceptions, have adopted the essential principle of gentilism, that of nationalism; and for the Catholic religion, which is superior to all family, tribal, or national distinctions, substitute purely national religions,—for each nation a religion, a creed, a worship of its own. Even those who still pretend to assert some sort of a church, place it, or suffer it to be placed, under the national authority, which is held to be, in all genuine Protestant nations, supreme alike in spirituals and temporals. You cannot shock even an American Protestant more than by asserting the catholicity and supremacy of religion, and the superiority of the church to the state, or her independence of the national authority. The standing objection to the church, here as in all Protestant countries, is, that she, by her claims of catholic authority, conflicts with the national authority or civil power, and asserts for herself, as a spiritual kingdom, an authority superior to that of the nation itself. This is the gist of Mr. Gladstone's "Expostulation," so promptly met by Dr. Newman, by Cardinal

Manning, and other distinguished prelates of the church in England and the United States. Doctrinal controversy has virtually ceased, and the church is opposed now, wherever opposed at all, on national and political grounds, that is, in the name of the nation or civil power.

Dr. Döllinger, fallen like Lucifer from heaven, appeals to nationalism, to the civil powers against the decrees of the Vatican; and it is as favoring nationalism, or the supremacy of the civil power, that the German imperial government favors the so-called Old Catholics, condemned heretics as they are; and it is in the name of the civil power, as opposed to secular supremacy, that it abridges the independence of the church, suppresses freedom of worship, imprisons and fines Catholic bishops and priests, exiles the religious orders from the empire, and wages a most bitter persecution against the noble Catholic Church in Germany. We see the same thing in Switzerland where the cantons have lost their state independence, and become subject in their internal affairs to federal authority. The Italian government in the hands of the infidel minority, obeying the directions of Protestant Europe, is not a whit behind Protestant Germany in persecuting Catholics. Nothing is more evident than that Protestantism is in its essence a protest against Catholicity, a return to the nationalism of the gentiles, that is, to heathenism, or the gentile apostasy. Indeed, it was on a charge of anti-secularism, or anti-nationalism, that is, of conspiring against Cæsar, the civil power, that Pilate, the representative of Cæsar in Judea, condemned and crucified our Lord; and it was as alleged enemies of Cæsar, or the civil power, that the early Christians were sent to the lions. They refused to worship the *national* gods, and therefore were treated as enemies of Cæsar and the empire.

It is not carelessly, nor without due deliberation, and weighing well our words, that we term Protestantism a return to nationalism or gentilism, and therefore not simply a heresy or a congeries of heresies, but a real apostasy. The true religion is necessarily catholic, for there is but one God, who is always and everywhere the same: the human race in all ages and nations, in spite of modern lying scientists, is one: the relation between this one human race and one God is always and everywhere the same: consequently, religion, which is founded in, and expresses, this relation, and prescribes the rights and duties which grow out of it, must be always and everywhere the same, that is to say, catholic.

With no change in the factors, there can be none in the result. Hence there never has been, and there cannot be, but one religion. Religion has never varied, but has been the same from the beginning. Our Lord taught no new religion, made, in fact, no new revelation. He came not to teach, or to introduce and establish a new religion, but to do and suffer those things necessary in the divine decrees; to fulfil the promises made to the fathers, to perfect their faith, and to secure to men their eternal beatitude, deification, or union with God. Those wise Germans, who sought to overthrow Christianity by proving that nearly all its principles, doctrines, and moral maxims were known and taught here and there before the birth of Christ, have only labored to confirm it, by giving proofs of its catholicity. Nothing is more false or absurd than the pretence that religion varies from age to age, and from nation to nation: a purely gentile or heathen notion.

Nationalism stands opposed to catholicity, and has been in all ages the chief weapon wielded by Satan against religion. It is, in fact, the deadly enemy of catholicity, for it not only has its root in affections natural to the human heart, but has physical force at its command to be used against its enemies, as well as wealth and honors with which to reward its friends. Moreover, to love and serve one's nation within certain limits is not reprehensible, but a natural virtue. To honor the king, obey the civil authority, or the public authorities of one's country, within the limits of the law of God, is a duty, and Christianity condemns disobedience to rulers as a sin against God. Hence Satan is able to use the civil authority in a manner to confuse and bewilder the conscience, and to make people believe that they are obeying religion, when, in fact, they are acting directly against it. Most people do not discriminate, and it is not easy for people left to their private judgment to define the boundaries of the jurisdiction of the civil power, and to say where its right to command ends, and obedience ceases to be a duty, or even lawful. The only safe rule is, to understand that the spiritual authority, commissioned to keep and interpret the law of God, defines alike its own powers and those of the state or nation. But this is precisely what nationalism will not concede. Claiming to be independent and supreme in its own sphere, it insists on judging for itself, defining its own powers, which it cannot do without at the same time defining the powers of the spiritual authority; thus, in effect,

asserting the supremacy of nationalism as against catholicity. In this way Satan confuses men's minds, and accomplishes his object, the denial of the catholicity of religion, or, in other words, the universal sovereignty of God.

If we analyze Protestantism, or study it in its historical developments, we shall be at no loss for proofs that it is essentially a protest against the catholicity of religion, and an effort to render religion national, subject to the national authority, and following the national movements and variations. One of the great objections urged against the Catholic Church is her immobility, and her absolute refusal to follow and conform to the changes or variations of public sentiment, opinion, or tendency. She is *semper eadem*. Was not the syllabus decried as behind and contrary to the age? Protestantism rests on a movable foundation; and Protestants seem to have come to the conclusion that whatever introduces an element of fixedness, permanence, or unchangeableness in the government of human affairs, is evil, opposed to the progress of society, and manifestly satanic, and not divine. They seem not to be aware that there is no motion where there is nothing at rest, and no real progress but by the aid of that which is already perfect, and therefore itself incapable of progress. They are as shallow and as unscientific as the Greek sophist, who taught that all things are in a perpetual flux and reflux: a doctrine substantially revived and elaborately defended under the head of evolution, by that grand philosophic charlatan, Herbert Spencer, honored by some as the great light of the age.

Unity and catholicity go together, and neither is, nor can be, of human origin. Man cannot create unity, nor universality. They come and can come only from God, who is himself one and universal. They can be introduced and maintained, in the visible order, only by a divinely commissioned, assisted, and protected vicar of Christ, who is authorized to teach and govern all men and nations in his name, as his representative on earth. The basis and necessary condition of unity and catholicity in the visible order, that is to say, the visible church, is unquestionably the papacy, as its powers are defined by the Vatican decrees. Yet all the world knows that the special object of attack by all classes of Protestants is the papacy. The Protestant instinct assures them that it is only by breaking down the papacy that they can get rid of catholicity, and bring religion, in their respective nations, under the national authority, and substitute for the church

of God, a national, and, therefore, a purely human or man-made church, which is all the Protestant churches so-called are or can pretend to be, if not really synagogues of Satan. We need adduce no further proofs that Protestantism is a protest against catholicity, and a revolt in favor of nationalism, that is to say, gentilism. As the church of Christ is founded on Peter, Protestants, in rejecting the papacy in which Peter survives, teaches, and governs, necessarily reject the Christian church, therefore the Christian religion itself; and hence, we rightly treat Protestantism as apostasy from Christ, and essentially anti-Christian, therefore as satanic, begotten of hatred of God and all good, and fatal alike to society and the souls of those who adhere to it against the light of the Gospel and the teachings of the church.

Of course, we do not expect to influence Protestants by these remarks, very few of whom will read them, and still fewer will appreciate them. We make them for the benefit of Catholics alone, to put them on their guard against encouraging a too intense nationality, or even a too intense patriotism. Nationalism stands, as we have said, opposed to catholicity, as sectarianism does to unity; and patriotism is a virtue, or even not censurable, only when subordinated to the law of God and Catholic charity. From the beginning, nationalism, as we have defined it, has been the most constant, the most formidable, and the most subtle enemy the popes have had to contend against in maintaining Catholic authority. It was nationalism, in the form of cæsarism, that crucified our Lord, as we have already remarked, and it was their nationalism and intense hatred of catholicity that induced the Jews, who had themselves degenerated into nationalists, to stir up the people in nearly every province of the empire against the early Christians; and it was nationalism, the pretended vindication of the gods of Rome, who were no gods, but devils, that instigated the cruel persecutions of the Christians in the martyr ages, drove the Catholics to the catacombs, and gave every pope for the first three centuries the crown of martyrdom. It was the same old enemy in a doctrinal guise the popes had to encounter in the Arian emperors, and without disguise in Julian the Apostate. Arianism was an attempted return to gentilism, and even to pagan idolatry, for while it maintained the Son was not God, but a creature, it paid him divine honors.

To the same spirit of nationalism we must attribute the troubles of the popes in the East. Acting mainly through

an imperial court, Cæsar, representing the national authority, would be supreme in spirituals, make religion national and not catholic, and thus caused the Greek schism, which ruined the Christendom of the East. Nothing but inveterate nationalism keeps Russia in schism and separated from the church of Christ. In the East we find even Catholic churches separated according to their nationalities, and in the same city a patriarch or metropolitan for Catholics of one nationality, and another for Catholics of another nationality. In every age, in the West as well as in the East, the popes have had their chief difficulties from kings, emperors, and petty princes representing the national or secular authority, who insisted on governing the church in their respective dominions, or on retaining old national customs and usages, incompatible with the purity of Catholic doctrine and worship. It was the spirit of nationalism that was at the bottom of the war between the popes and emperors about investiture; and all the world knows that it was the intense nationalism of the French that created the great schism of the West, and which was never wholly extinguished till the publication of the Vatican decrees in 1870. Its spirit survived in the Gallicanism of the four articles, and appeared in all its force in the civil constitution of the clergy, adopted by the French revolutionists.

It is unnecessary to continue this line of argument. Nothing is more evident than that nationalism, only another name for secularism, is the deadliest foe of Catholicity. In some of its forms and disguises it is constantly finding its way, in spite of the utmost vigilance of pastors of the church, into the Catholic camp, and weakening the devotion of Catholics to the Holy See, and giving more or less occasion to Satan to seduce them from their fidelity. It finds its way under the form of something good and desirable, without its real character being seen or suspected, and men yield to it with the best and honestest intentions in the world. Yet, so sedulous is the Holy See to guard the faithful against it, that it would not allow the council of the archbishops and bishops of all the provinces of the Union to call itself a *national* council, but itself changed the term *national* to that of *plenary*. Hence we have had two plenary councils, but no national council, and we trust we never shall have. The term *national* has no application to any thing Catholic:— "God has made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." In Christ there is neither

Greek nor barbarian, neither bond nor free, and, let us add, neither black nor white, neither red nor yellow. The Gospel recognizes none of these distinctions of race or nation, of which gentilism makes so much. We have heard some Catholics say, "We want a native clergy." We have never sympathized with them. We might as well say, We want a native, that is, a national God. We want an educated, learned, intelligent, and devoted clergy, who know and faithfully perform their duties as priests and spiritual directors: but where born or trained, of what nation or race they spring, or of what complexion they are, is to us a matter of perfect indifference. It suffices for us that they are men and priests of the Most High God, and servants of Christ, our Lord and Master. Poland wellnigh lost her faith, because she would tolerate only a native clergy, and Mexico struck almost a fatal blow to her catholicity, when she expelled from her territory all priests and religious not of Mexican birth. Far distant be the day when Catholics in America insist on national distinctions in the priesthood. These have always been the views presented in the *Review*. That the contrary is very extensively believed by an honest portion of our Catholic people, especially of Irish birth or descent, is no doubt true; for the Irish national journals published in this country take the rebukes the *Review* sometimes administers to them for obtruding their nationality and forever parading "our element," as the expression of an anti-Irish feeling on our part,and the assertion of an exclusive "Native Americanism," or "Know-nothingism." This is both silly and unjust. No man has more ably defended the Irish than we did in our review of Father Thébaud's "Irish Race in the Past and the Present," for which more than one Irish journal roundly abused us. Our warmest and most intimate friends are, and always have been, among the Catholic Irish, especially priests of Irish birth or descent. Our quarrel is not with the Irish, but we sometimes feel it necessary to rebuke some Irish journalists who are perpetually obtruding their nationality upon us, and, in doing so, we do but remind them that it is they, not we, who are making national distinctions.

The great body of the Catholic Irish in this country, as far as we know them, hold their religion to be supreme, as the first thing to be provided for; and they either do, or intend to, subordinate their Irish politics to their church. They have never received, and never will receive, any opposition or

disrespect from us for their nationality. We honor and love them for their faith and fidelity to religion; but neither more nor less because they are Irish by birth or descent. Their Irish nationality counts for nothing with us, and we should be glad never to hear it alluded to. People are to be judged by what they are, not by their race or nation. This, as we have learned it, is the Catholic rule; the contrary is the gentile rule. This Catholic rule is especially necessary to be scrupulously observed in a cosmopolite nation like ours, made up as it is of emigrants from every race and nation of the globe; and our complaint of some Irish-American journals is, that they are perpetually violating it, unconsciously, it may be, in favor of their own race and nation.

We cut the following paragraph from an article in the most widely circulated Irish-Catholic journal in the country, and one which now and then contains an able and well-written article on Catholic subjects, and deserving Catholic approval:—

"Dr. Brownson says he takes no interest in anything but Catholic politics and Catholic leaders. *In the name of God he is preaching the devil's own doctrine*—the old English doctrine of dissension. Are the Catholic citizens of this country to repudiate the deeds of all Protestant Americans, and scout the memory of the Protestant Washington? Are Irish Catholics, at Dr. Brownson's bidding, to forget the name and fame of such a Protestant Irishman as Edmund Burke, who was addressed by Pope Pius VI. as a 'noble man' and a benefactor to the world? Dr. Brownson, we suppose, would reject the services of Warren and Putnam at Bunker Hill, because they were Protestants; he would depose Washington, Clay, Henry, and the others, from their high place in the national memory; he would reject Grant, Sherman, and Thomas, because they were Protestants, and fling Sheridan after them because he was only a middling Catholic. *Dr. Brownson mixes too much religion in his politics.* His intolerant meddling can bring nothing but discredit on catholicity."

The charge, that "Dr. Brownson mixes too much religion in his politics," is especially edifying in a professedly Catholic journal. The whole article goes to prove the incompatibility of intense nationalism and catholicity; and that Catholics who allow themselves to be governed by it soon lose their Catholic integrity, and glide insensibly, and without suspecting it, into virtual Protestantism, and therefore into gentilism. It shows how dangerous it is for Catholics to allow themselves to be absorbed in national and political questions, independent of the interests of religion. Of

course, Dr. Brownson never said what the journalist alleges, for, though he may be an "old hypocrite," as the same journalist, in a subsequent number, courteously calls him, he is not a downright fool. He said that Irish Protestants were no more to him than Protestants of any other nationality, that his interest was in Catholic Ireland, and in Irish politics only so far as they affected the church and Catholic interests. This may be "preaching the devil's own doctrine," but, we think, a less poetic imagination than is possessed by the editor of the journal referred to, would hardly have discovered it. We never bid or urged Irish Catholics to forget the name and fame of Irish Protestants. We only said, "Irish Protestants are no more *to us* than Protestants of any other nationality." We, as a Catholic, recognize the natural virtues, and we hold, as St. Augustine teaches, that the ancient gentiles had many of them, for which God gave them a reward in this world. We know no reason why as much should not be ascribed to Protestants and infidels, their successors in the present.

Dr. Brownson has never said that "he takes no interest in any thing but Catholic politics and Catholic leaders." This is a poetical gloss; and the essence of poetry, it has been said, is fiction. In our own country we take no interest in mere party politics, which are little else than a struggle between the *ins* and the *outs;* and in Irish politics we take an interest only in their bearing on the church and Catholic questions, of which we believe the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland are more competent judges than Protestant lawyers and infidel "Head-Centres," or the chiefs of secret societies reprobated by the Holy See. What we say of Irish politics, we say of English politics, of Spanish, French, German, Russian, or Italian politics. We believe with the late Frederic Schlegel, that God orders universal history in reference to and for the glory of the Word, or *ad Incarnationem.* Christ, the incarnate Word, creates the church, as God creates the universe or cosmos. All politics must in the last resort be judged by their bearing on the glory of the Word or the church: a doctrine, of course, passing the understanding of all intense nationalists, to whose dense theological ignorance it has no meaning. Nature herself is in order to grace, and, detached from the end for which it exists, is worthless. Natural or gentile virtues are not sins, as Jansenists and Calvinists, in their exaggeration of the effects of the fall, maintain when they assert that "all the works of

infidels are sins;" but they do not advance us a single step towards heaven, our final cause, which is supernatural, and are rewarded only with temporal goods in this life. Yet, for Catholics who have been regenerated, elevated by the Holy Ghost in baptism to the supernatural order, the order founded by the incarnate Word, to forget that all their acts are to be performed in reference to the Incarnation and for the glory of the Word, and to fall back "to the beggarly elements of this world," and to live and act as simple natural men, is *in them* practical apostasy, and they are fearfully guilty, even though they abound in the natural or gentile virtues.

In the divine economy, though grace supplements nature without destroying it, the natural is subordinate to the supernatural, for which it is created and exists; and detached from the supernatural, and considered in itself alone, the Catholic cannot live for it, or make it the end of his acts. If he does so he ceases to be a Catholic, and becomes a gentile or heathen. Thus says our Lord: "Be not solicitous, therefore, saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? *For after all these things do the heathen seek.* For your Father knoweth ye have need of all these things. Seek ye, therefore, first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you." The need of natural goods is not to be denied; but to make them the direct object of our solicitude, is to do as the heathen do. We are to live, not for them, but for the kingdom of God and his justice, or the supernatural good, or the honor and glory of the incarnate Word and union with God, for which we are created; and if we do so, these things, as far as necessary or useful, will follow. These principles will solve for us our entire relation to the natural order, and, therefore, the relation of Catholics to national and political questions. It is not pretended that Catholics are to take no interest in national or political affairs. We have complained of them in this very article for not doing so, especially where the interests of their religion are involved. What we maintain is, that we are to seek national and political objects, as every other species of temporal goods, not for their own sake, but for the sake of the kingdom of God and his justice, or the spiritual and eternal destiny of man and nature, as already stated. We are to seek them, or to labor for them, only in subordination and subserviency to the interests of religion. We live in society,

and men have social relations, and therefore, social duties. We must love our neighbor as ourselves, but in God. When called upon by the public authorities, Catholics are bound, as all men are, to defend their country against foreign invasion, against an unjust war and internal rebellion, at the expense of their property, and, if need be, at the expense of their lives. We are bound to be vigilant in guarding and resolute in defending the freedom and independence of the church, and, when authorized by the sovereign pontiff, to do battle against the tyrant who would oppress the Catholic conscience, and abridge or suppress the rights of religion, which are the rights of God, without which the rights of man are a mockery and a delusion. The popes have often intervened in national and political questions, in some few instances even to the deposition of the tyrannical prince, and the absolution of his subjects from their oath of fidelity; but, as far as we can discover, only for the freedom and independence of the spiritual order, in no instance for the sake of the temporal order itself, although their intervention in behalf of the rights of religion or the church not seldom redressed great temporal evils and secured great temporal good.

We are apt to forget that the Catholic Church represents the divine authority on earth, as well as the divine goodness, love, and mercy. Secure her liberty, her perfect freedom and independence in any country, and you secure, no matter what the form of government, all practicable or desirable individual, social, and political liberty. Secure this first, and all other true liberty will be added or follow:—"If the Son makes you free, ye shall be free indeed." What right have Catholics to doubt the word, or to distrust the promises of our Lord? We are ready to take our part in politics, so far as necessary, for the purpose of emancipating the Catholics oppressed by the state, to secure to Catholics freedom of the Catholic faith and worship, and to the church her right to educate the child of Catholic parents: for the education of the young is a function of the church, and provided for in the sacrament of orders. But where no Catholic interest is involved, where the church is free and measurably secure in her freedom, where no spiritual end is to be gained, we doubt the lawfulness, and certainly deny the utility, of political agitation. An agitation, like that headed by O'Connell in Ireland, for the relief of Catholics suffering from unjust, most iniquitous Protestant legislation, we can

understand, and hold it to be eminently Catholic; for so long as Catholics were denied, on account of their religion, the common rights of citizens or subjects, excluded from office, and from seats in parliament, their religion was not free, and their church was abridged of her rights. His subsequent agitation for the repeal of the union had not the same sacredness for us, for we have never been able to see that any Catholic interest was to be promoted by it. With the Irish agitation for national independence of England, carried on chiefly in this country, we have had no sympathy, either as a Catholic or as an American citizen. Catholics have as little to complain of in Ireland as in England. Indeed, Catholics are as free in all the British isles and in the British colonies, to say the least, as they are in the United States, and enjoy not a few advantages that we have not. The national-school system in Ireland may have its objectionable features, but we should jump with delight if we had here a system of public education one-half as liberal to Catholics as it is. We may be very wrong, but, as long as Great Britain respects the religious rights of Catholics, as she has shown in these last few years a disposition to do, Irish Catholics have as little reason to be discontented with the government as have English Catholics; and in these times of great centralized empires, and when small states hold their separate existence only at the mercy of their more powerful neighbors, it is doubtful if the Irish would gain in security and consideration by having their country severed from all connection with Great Britain, the freest and most powerful of modern states. Time, patience, and perseverance can secure to Irish Catholics what is still lacking to place them on a footing of complete equality before the state with their Protestant fellow-subjects; while their connection with the empire, and representation in the imperial parliament, serve or might serve as a powerful protection, encouragement, and support to Catholics in the rest of the British dominions. It seems to us that Catholic interests throughout the world require Catholics everywhere to do all in their power to strengthen the Catholic element in the British empire. Ireland, if she gained her independence, might have great difficulty in maintaining it. The Irish republic, organized on our soil, very soon found itself torn by intestine divisions, and finally divided into two separate and not friendly organizations. The Irish are a gifted race, but they have too many able men aspiring to be "head-centres," to be a united race.

But, be all this as it may, one thing is certain, that the constant agitation of any people for national and political objects, no matter under what name, has a deleterious effect on Catholics, and tends to diminish faith and fervor, especially in the younger class. We have shown that the essential principle of Protestantism is nationalism, that is, gentilism; and that gentilism, or nationalism, stands directly opposed to catholicity, and in all ages and nations is the most persistent and formidable enemy of the church, or the city of God. Men cannot, then, become absorbed in national and political objects for their own sake, where no Catholic interests are involved, which require to be defended, protected, or promoted, without losing in a measure their Catholic integrity, and assimilating themselves to Protestants. Your intense national journals may publish from time to time able Catholic articles, and valuable Catholic intelligence; but their tone and spirit, their silent and unsuspected influence, is to protestantize, that is, secularize their readers, and to make them feel that religion does not cover the whole duty of man; and ends by subordinating religion to secular interests, that is to the world.

We have illustrated our doctrine by reference to the Irish national and political agitation at home and abroad, because the great body of our English-speaking Catholics are Irish either by birth or descent; but we hold that a similar agitation for American national and political objects is no less to be deprecated. To put up American nationality against Irish nationality would be as objectionable as to put up Irish nationality against American nationality; and it is no more in accordance with catholicity for Americans to be absorbed in American politics, than it is for Irishmen at home and abroad to be absorbed in Irish politics. It is not Irish polities, or Irish political agitation as such, that we oppose, but nationalism, whether Irish or English, German or American, and one not more than the other; because nationalism stands always opposed to catholicity, and is of the essence of Protestantism, gentilism, or paganism. In our country there is and can be no agitation for national independence, for we are politically subject to no foreign power; but, as the people here are virtually the government, it is, no doubt, the duty of every citizen, as far as practicable, to master the science of government and its administration, and to take part in the election of representatives and rulers. But we are always to remember that the government does not exist

for its own sake; it exists for the common good. The temporal order itself does not exist for itself, but for the spiritual and eternal, for the honor and glory of the incarnate Word. Politics are, therefore, always to be subordinated to religion, and cultivated, if at all, for a spiritual or religious end, which Catholics are never at liberty to forget, as those do who say, "My religion has nothing to do with my politics:" as if in political action men are emancipated from the divine sovereignty!

We know of nothing that has or can have a more deleterious effect on the moral and religious character of the people than the ceaseless political agitation which our demagogues and journals keep up, and in which the American people are constantly absorbed, when not still more deeply absorbed in the pursuit of riches. Even the well-disposed have little time for meditation and prayer. The moral standard with us is probably lower than with any other civilized people; and our politicians, unless grossly belied, are as corrupt as men well can be. It would seem that there is among them neither honesty nor honor. The sense of justice, fidelity to trust, whether public or private, would seem to be obsolete. The elected guardians of the public interests would seem to be chiefly intent upon public plunder, or, in slang phrase, pickings and stealings, and sometimes on a gigantic scale. The very police, maintained to protect private citizens in their person and property, and to restrain vice and immorality and maintain the peace, are said to connive at crime, and to be not seldom the accomplices of the criminals they should arrest. In no other country in the world does the government, either directly or indirectly, take to itself so large a portion of the earnings of the people; and the larger portion of what the government leaves is gathered up by the huge corporations that cover the land, and goes to support the luxury and extravagance of their officers, and to pay the interest on their borrowed capital, or borrowed credit rather. In no other country does the government effect so little for the common good, set so bad an example to the people, or do so much to corrupt them. This is what comes of the absorption of the American people in politics, and what they gain by their devotion to the world and the acquisition of sensible goods, or by living and acting for the natural emancipated from its subordination to the supernatural order, that is to say, religion. Yet, says the Boston *Pilot*, "Dr. Brownson mixes too much religion with his

politics; and his intolerant meddling can only bring discredit on catholicity." The present state of Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and Spain, is a striking comment on the political atheism which that journal, perhaps unwittingly, defends, and abuses us for opposing.

The greatest difficulty a Catholic reviewer encounters is in convincing Catholic laymen and journalists that catholic means catholic. The difficulty is almost as great as that of convincing certain routinist philosophers that nothing is nothing, not something. If religion is catholic, it is supreme and universal, the supreme law in every department of life, extending to every species of human activity. Whether we eat or drink, whether we sleep or wake, whatever we do, we are to do it for the glory of God. The goods of this life, whether national or political, social or economical, are never secured, or, if secured, cease to be goods, by being made the direct object or end of our activity:—"Seek, first, the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you." This is the lesson that the Protestants or gentiles, and even some Catholics, forget, and which only the Catholic Church can keep in the memory either of individuals or nations. It is a grief to her maternal heart when her children forget it, and live like Protestants or gentiles, intent only on those things "after which the heathen seek."

We do not deny that men should love and serve their country to the best of their ability according to their state in life, but in God and for the sake of a spiritual good; that is, if they pretend to be Christians, and to take the Gospel as their rule of life. We do not much like the device of the Spanish Carlists, "God and our Country," as if God and country were on the same level. We should say, God and our Country in God and for God. We like just as little that adopted by the youthful Montalembert, "God and Liberty." God and liberty are not to be treated as if they stood on a par, for there is no liberty but in God and by him. Neither liberty nor country is to be sought for its own sake, or as a real good in itself. In all the eloquent declamations we hear about liberty and patriotism, and which stir our blood, there is a smack of heathenism. They are plagiarized from the pagan classics in which our youth are trained, and in which there is no trace of the primitive revelation of the true end or beatitude of man. There is in the classic temple no spire pointing to heaven, and teaching

the soul to aspire thitherward. The gods of the classics are simple abstractions, earthly gods, or gods infernal. The highest worship revealed to us in the classics is the worship of the beauty of form and idea, if you will, but never the beauty of holiness. The classic morals are based either on pleasure or interest. Our youth, indoctrinated in these, have their minds early cast in a pagan mould, and find very offensive the teaching of the Gospel: that the creature does not exist for itself; that this world is not our home; that we are pilgrims and sojourners here, seeking a city whose builder and maker is God, eternal in the heavens; that our true country is in the world beyond the grave, and that our true beatitude is in the supernatural, and is to be obtained only by self-denial and self-sacrifice.

We have treated Protestant journalism not precisely from the point of view of the brilliant author of the work before us, and we have taken from it occasion to say many things which will hardly fail to displease even those Catholics who believe that a compromise between catholicity and gentilism, Christ and Belial, God and the world, is practicable; and that our Lord was too rigid and intolerant when he told his disciples that they could not serve two masters, or God and Mammon. The Protestant reformers did not believe him, but their successive developments have verified his words, and they have abandoned God for Mammon, and Christianity for the world. We have never doubted his words; and so, when we were a Protestant, we gave up heaven for earth, and labored to create an earthly paradise. When through the divine mercy we became a Catholic, we still believed them, and held no compromise to be practicable, and felt that as a Catholic we must take the other side, and subordinate every thing to religion, to the final end of man, his supernatural union with God in glory. We have found this uncompromising catholicity not very popular with all Catholics. We have been accused of taking extreme views, of going too far, of being too rigid, and deficient in the meekness and charity of the Gospel. We have in this article said things which will not please everybody, and not a few will object to our maintaining that all national and political questions or interests are by the law of God subordinated to catholicity. But we must be one thing or another, and hold either that the Lord is God, or that Baal is God. Having learned, by bitter experience, that Baal is not God, we have no alternative but to say the Lord is God.

and him only is it permitted us to serve. We have no wish to offend any susceptibility, but as we grow older and approach nearer the grave, we lose all craving for popularity, the charms of earth cease to attract us, and our affections, as our thoughts, fasten exclusively on "the unseen and eternal." The wrath or the vituperation of offended journals cannot seriously disturb us, divert our course, or induce us to withhold the truth that seems to us necessary to be told.

END OF VOLUME XIII.

3 5282 00007 2630

3 5282 00007 2630